

## Durham E-Theses

---

### *A special study of the language and contents of Josephus' 'Jewish Antiquities' books XI - XX*

Shutt, R. J. H.

#### How to cite:

---

Shutt, R. J. H. (1936) *A special study of the language and contents of Josephus' 'Jewish Antiquities' books XI - XX*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/10313/>

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

---

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP  
e-mail: [e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk](mailto:e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk) Tel: +44 0191 334 6107  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>



A S P E C I A L S T U D Y  
o f t h e  
L A N G U A G E A N D C O N T E N T S  
o f  
J O S E P H U S ' ' J E W I S H A N T I Q U I T I E S ' ,  
B O O K S X I - X X .

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.

*R. G. H. Shutt.*

# B I B L I O G R A P H Y.

## Texts, Editions, and Translations.

- Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Roman Antiquities. C. Jacoby. Leipzig. Teubner.
- Josephus. Fl. Josephus De Bello Jud. E. Cardwell. Oxford 1837.
- The Works of Josephus. J. Hudson. Oxford 1720.
- (~~A Latin~~) MS., <sup>B. II. 1,</sup> (~~in the~~) Cathedral Library, Durham, (~~B. II. 1,~~) <sup>Latin,</sup> containing the 'Jewish Antiquities' and the 'Jewish War'.
- Opera Omnia. S. A. Naber. Leipzig. Teubner. 1890 - 1896.
- Opera Omnia. B. Niese. Berlin. 1890 - 1894.
- Trans. A. R. Shilleto. Bohn Library. London. 1900 - 1903.
- Trans. H. St. J. Thackeray. London. Heinemann. Loeb Classical Library. 1926 -
- Trans. W. Whiston. Edinburgh. Nimmo, Hay and Mitchell. First published 1737.
- Nicolaus of Damascus. Fragments. Ed. Orelli. Leipzig. 1804.
- Plutarch. Lives. Trans. B. Perrin. London. Heinemann. Loeb Classical Library.
- Polybius. Trans. W. R. Paton. London. Heinemann. Loeb Classical Library.
- Septuagint. The Old Testament in Greek. H. B. Swete. Cambridge. 1887.
- Strabo. Geography. Trans. H. L. Jones. London. Heinemann. Loeb Classical Library.
- Suetonius. Trans. J. C. Rolfe. London. Heinemann. Loeb Classical Library.
- Omnia Opera. Ed. C. L. Roth. Leipzig. 1858.
- Suidas. Ed. Ludolphus Kusterus. Cambridge. 1705.
- Tacitus. Annals. Ed. H. Furneaux. Oxford. 1896.
- Histories. Ed. W. A. Spooner. London. Macmillan. 1891.

## Works of Reference.

- Bury J. B. (ed.) Cambridge Ancient History. Cambridge. 1923 -
- Capelli A. Dizionario di Abbreviature. Milan. U. Hoepli. 1912.
- Gore C. (ed.) A New Commentary on Holy Scripture. London. S. P. C. K. 1928.
- Gow J. A Companion to School Classics. London. Macmillan. 1902.
- Hastings J. Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. (art. Josephus) Edinburgh. Clark. 1915 - 1918.
- Hastings J. Dictionary of the Bible. (art. Josephus) Edinburgh. Clark. 1903.
- Hastings J. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. (art. Josephus) Edinburgh. Clark. 1914.
- Hatch E. and Redpath H. A. A Concordance to the Septuagint. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1897.
- Peake A. S. A Commentary on the Bible. Edinburgh. Jack. 1919.
- Pauly-Wissowa. Real-Encyclopädie der class. Altertumswissenschaft. Stuttgart. 1916 -
- Smith W. and Wace H. Dictionary of Christian Biography. (art. Josephus) London. Murray. 1900.
- Thackeray H. St. J. A Lexicon to Josephus. Paris. P. Geuther. Parts I-II.

# B I B L I O G R A P H Y. (Contd.)

## General.

- Abrahams I. Schweich Lectures. 1922.
- Albert K. Strabo als Quelle des Flavius Josephus. Aschaffenburg. 1902.
- Balsdon J.P.V.D. The Emperor Gaius. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1934.
- Bate H.N. A Guide to the Epistles of St. Paul. London. Longmans. 1926.
- Bevan E.R. Jerusalem under the High Priests. London. 1924.
- Bloch H. Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in seiner Archaeologie. Leipzig. 1879.
- Braun M. Grieschicher-Roman und Hellenistische Geschichtschreibung. Frankfurt. 1934.
- Burkitt F.C. The Gospel History and its Transmission. Edinburgh. Clark. 1911.
- Bury J.B. Student's Roman Empire. London. Murray. 1930.
- Butcher S.H. Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects. London. Macmillan. 1904.
- Charlesworth M.P. Cambridge Historical Journal. vol. 4, no. 2. 1933.
- Clark A.C. Acts of the Apostles. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1933.
- Destinon J.V. Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der judischen Archäologie. B. XII-XVII. Kiel. 1882.
- Duff J. Wight. A Literary History of Rome. London. Unwin. 1910.
- Dupin L.E. Nova Bibliotheca Auctorum Ecclesiasticorum. 1692.
- Eisler R. The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist. (Eng. Trans.) London. Methuen. 1929.
- Ewald H. History of Israel. (Eng. Trans.) London. Longmans. 1876.
- Glator O. On the style of Polybius.
- Goguel M. Jésus et le messianisme politique. (Revue Historique 1929.)
- Graetz H. History of the Jews. (Eng. Trans.) London. Nutt. 1891.
- Hodgkin T. Italy and her Invaders. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1892.
- Jack J.W. The Historic Christ. Edinburgh. Clark. 1933.
- Jackson F.J. Foakes. Josephus and the Jews. London. S.P.C.K. 1930.
- Jackson F.J. Foakes, and Lake K. The Beginnings of Christianity. London. Macmillan. 1920.
- Klausner J. Jesus of Nazareth, his life, times, and teaching. (Eng. Trans.) London. Macmillan. 1929.
- Korach L. Über den Wert des Josephus als Quelle für die röm. Geschichte. Breslau. 1895.
- Laqueur R. Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Giessen. 1920.
- Liempt L. Van. Mnemosyne. LV. 1927. pp. 109-116 'De Testimonio Flaviano'.
- Lightfoot J.B. St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. London. Macmillan. 1869.
- Madden F.W. Jewish Coinage. London. 1864.
- Meyer P. Quaestiones Strabonianae. Leipzig. 1879.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y. (Contd.)

General.

- Milne. J.G. A History of Egypt: *under Roman Rule*. London. Methuen. 1898.
- Mogliano A. The Emperor Claudius. (Eng. Trans.) Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1934.
- Mommsen Th. Provinces of the Roman Empire. (Eng. Trans.) London. Macmillan. 1909.
- Muller G.A. Christus bei Josephus. Innsbruck. 1895.
- Murray G. Ancient Greek Literature. London. Heinemann. 1911.
- Nygren A. Agape and Eros. (Eng. Trans.) London. S.P.C.K. 1932.
- Oesterley W.O.E., and Robinson T.H. Hebrew Religion. London. S.P.C.K. 1933.
- Oesterley W.O.E., and Robinson T.H. A History of Israel. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1932.
- Rud T. Catalogue of MSS. in the Cathedral Library, Durham. 1825.
- Schloering A. Le Judaïsme de F. Joseph. Cabors. 1901.
- Schmidt G. De Flavii Josephi Elocutione Observationes Criticae. Leipzig. 1893.
- Schurer E. A History of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ. (Eng. Trans.) Edinburgh. Clark. 1910.
- Smith G.A. Historical Geography of the Holy Land. London. 1904.
- Smith G.A., and Bartholomew G. Historical Atlas. London. 1915.
- Strachan-Davidson J.L. Polybius, in 'Hellenica', ed. E. Abbott. London. Rivington. 1880.
- Swete H.B. Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge. 1902.
- Tarn W.W. Hellenistic Civilization. London. 1930.
- Taylor L.R. American Journal of Philology. LIV. 2.
- Teuffel W.S. A History of Roman Literature. (Eng. Trans.) London. Bell. 1873.
- Thackeray H. St. J. Josephus, the Man and the Historian. New York. Jewish Inst. of Religion Press. 1929.
- Thackeray H. St. J. Selections from Josephus. London. S.P.C.K. 1919.
- Various Authors. Judaism and the Beginnings of Christianity. London. Routledge. 1923.
- Wright F.A. History of Later Greek Literature. London. Routledge. 1932.

# C O N T E N T S.

Title.	i
Summary.	ii
Bibliography.	iii - v
List of Contents.	vi
 The Life of Josephus - a short sketch.	 1 - 6
Josephus in Galilee.	7 - 14
Laqueur's view of the 'Rechenschaftsbericht', and Josephus.	15 - 21
Epaphroditus - the publisher of some of Josephus' works.	22 - 27
Dionysius of Halicarnassus.	28 - 36
Josephus and Polybius.	37 - 40
Josephus and Strabo.	41 - 43
The use which Josephus makes of Esdras A, Nehemiah, Esther and I. Maccabees.	44 - 50
The use made by Josephus of the 'Letter of Aristeas'.	51 - 57
Nicolaus of Damascus.	58 - 69
The sources of Josephus, Ant. XVIII - XX.	70 - 84
The theory of a "Thucydidean Assistant" who was responsible for Ant. XVII-XIX.	85 - 97
The "Assistants" of the Bellum Judaicum. (B.J.)	98 - 108
The style of Ant. XVII - XIX - an analysis.	109 - 119
Ant. XX. and 'Vita' - an analysis.	120 - 130
The Latin version of Josephus' works: it's nature and value.	131 - 148
Adversaria in Josephum.	149 - 168
The Testimonium Flavianum.	169 - 183
Josephus: the Man and the Historian.	184 - 193
 <u>Appendices.</u>	
The Procurators of Judaea.	194 - 206
The Kings of Persia, etc.	207 - 220
The supposed dependence of the style of Josephus upon that of Nicolaus of Damascus.	221 - 224
On the theory of a "Sophoclean Assistant" who was responsible for Ant. XV - XVI.	225 - 226
Did Luke use Josephus' 'Antiquities'?	227 - 233

THE LIFE OF JOSEPHUS - a short sketch.

Josephus was born "in the first year of the principate of Gaius Caesar", that is between 37 and 38 A.D. He was the son of Matthias, and was "by birth a Hebrew from Jerusalem, and a priest". He was descended from a line of priests of the first order,<sup>2</sup> and on his mother's side from the royal stock of the Hasmonean house. Of such lineage he was justly proud.<sup>3</sup> His mother tongue was Aramaic. Josephus was brought up with his brother Matthias, receiving no doubt the best education available for the son of a priest, including instruction in the Law by learned Rabbis; he was also, if we may trust his own statements a very promising pupil, for, at the age of fourteen, his love of learning was acclaimed by all,<sup>4</sup> and he was consulted by the High-priests and foremost men in the city on points of the Law, and their correct interpretation. By the time he reached the age of sixteen (i.e. 53 A.D.) he had to make the choice, with which Jewish sect he was going to throw in his lot.<sup>5</sup> Taking the very sensible view that the only way really to choose for himself was to see for himself, he spent three years gaining experience of the different sects (his accounts<sup>6</sup> of these sects testify to his thoroughness), and even joined a certain Banus,<sup>7</sup> who with his followers, lived in the desert a strict ascetic life inspired by Essene ideals. After three years he returned. His mind was made up, and he definitely attached himself to the sect of the Pharisees, "which is similar to that of the Stoics".<sup>8</sup> This was in 56 A.D.

The next seven years of his life were spent in the comparative quiet of a priest's daily round of duties, until, "after the twenty-sixth year of his life",<sup>9</sup> he was sent on a mission to Rome to procure the liberation of certain of his fellow-priests whom Felix the procurator had imprisoned. Although ship-wrecked in the Adriatic he finally arrived in safety, and with the help of Alityrus, (a Jewish actor who was a favourite of Nero) and Poppaea the Emperor's wife, who was favourably inclined towards Judaism<sup>10</sup> obtained the release of the prisoners. He returned with

<sup>1</sup> Vita 5. <sup>2</sup> Vita 2. <sup>3</sup> Vita I: Contra Ap. I. 54. <sup>4</sup> Vita 9. <sup>5</sup> Vita 10. <sup>6</sup> Ant. XVIII. 11-25, B.S. II. 119-167. <sup>7</sup> Vita 11. <sup>8</sup> Vita 12. <sup>9</sup> Vita 13. <sup>10</sup> Vita 16.



gifts from Rome,<sup>11</sup> and what is important for his subsequent career, a lively appreciation of the power and "Fortune" of the Roman Empire.<sup>12</sup> The revolt from Rome was just beginning in Judaea when he returned and no efforts of his could restrain the "madness" of the instigators:<sup>13</sup> he was even forced to take refuge in the Temple for safety. The other Pharisees could avail nothing either,<sup>14</sup> so they played a waiting game, hoping for the intervention of Cestius Gallus, the Roman governor. He was unexpectedly defeated at Beth-horon and the rebels gained fresh confidence.

The Sanhedrin had to consider their plan of action, and Josephus was sent with two other priests to Galilee, on a mission of peace to disarm the "robbers",<sup>15</sup> or, according to his other account, as general to organise further war against Rome.<sup>16</sup> The problem of the position of Josephus in Galilee is a difficult one. Taking the barest outline, and using facts which are beyond contention, we see that Josephus encountered much opposition in Galilee; Tiberias was seething with different factions, favourable to Rome or hostile to Rome, and there was even trouble within separate parties; Gamala was on the whole loyal to Rome, and Sepphoris also. Josephus encountered opposition from John of Gischala, who complained to Jerusalem that he was aiming at a tyranny, and from Justus of Tiberias. In the end, Josephus emerges fighting against Rome, holding Jotapata against Vespasian. After a siege lasting forty-seven days it was captured, and Josephus with thirty-nine others took refuge in a cave. In desperation these prisoners contemplated suicide, but were dissuaded by Josephus:<sup>17</sup> then they drew lots to decide who should die. Josephus escaped (whether by luck or management of the lots is problematical), and finally surrendered, and was led before Vespasian,<sup>18</sup> to whom he prophesied that he would one day become Emperor of Rome.<sup>19</sup> Largely through the instrumentality of Titus, he was treated as an honourable captive.<sup>20</sup>

The year 69 A.D. saw the fulfilment of Josephus' prophecy: as a reward, he was made a "libertus" of Vespasian, and taking the

<sup>11</sup> Vita 46. <sup>12</sup> Vita 17. <sup>13</sup> Vita 19. <sup>14</sup> Vita 22. <sup>15</sup> Vita 29. <sup>16</sup> B.J. II. 562-563. <sup>17</sup> B.J. III. 383. <sup>18</sup> B.J. III. 392. <sup>19</sup> B.J. IV. 402. Suet. Vesp. 5; Dio Cass. LXVI. 1. <sup>20</sup> B.J. III. 408, Vita 44.

name of his "patronus" according to custom, was henceforth known as Flavius Josephus.<sup>21</sup> He accompanied Vespasian to Alexandria,<sup>22</sup> but returned with Titus to the siege of Jerusalem, where he was used as interpreter, and spokesman of Roman offers of terms to the besieged.<sup>23</sup> While performing this duty, he was frequently railed at, and even shot at, once being wounded.<sup>24</sup> Even at this time he kept notes of the proceedings,<sup>25</sup> and was undeniably in an ideal position for observing, especially events in the Roman camp. The city finally surrendered, and the Temple was burnt down (whether by Titus' orders or in spite of them is again doubtful.) Josephus at this time took advantage of his position with Titus to save fifty of his friends,<sup>26</sup> and on another occasion, three who were already crucified.<sup>27</sup>

Josephus now went to Rome, and was installed in a house once belonging to Vespasian, and granted Roman citizenship, a pension,<sup>28</sup> and an estate.<sup>29</sup> The revolt of Cyrene (A.D. 73) was the occasion for an accusation by a certain Jonathan against Josephus, of having secretly supported the rebels there. Vespasian rejected the calumny,<sup>30</sup> and in token of continued favour we may assume, granted him another "considerable" estate in Judaea.<sup>31</sup> About this

time Josephus wrote the "Bellum Judaicum", first in Aramaic for the "upper barbarians",<sup>32</sup> as an official Roman manifesto; then, with the aid of "assistants",<sup>33</sup> he translated it into Greek and presented it to Vespasian and Titus, (~~79 A.D.~~<sup>34</sup> death of Vespasian, is therefore a terminus ante quem; and the Temple of Victory, dedicated in 75 A.D. a terminus post quem) (~~and Agrippa II. (Vita 366 quotes a letter of commendation from him.)~~)

Josephus must have lived in comfort in Rome, enjoying Imperial favour, and the death of Vespasian in 79 A.D., must have been the occasion of feelings of personal loss for him, but on the death of Titus (81 A.D.) he must have felt considerable anxiety for his future as well. Domitian's reign of terror caused Tacitus and Juvenal to cease their literary activities; yet under Domitian,<sup>35</sup> Josephus' honours were increased, and he received exemption from tax for his Jewish estates. Under Domitian too the "Jewish

Antiquities" appeared, dealing with the history of the Jews from

<sup>21</sup> J. J. IV. 626. <sup>22</sup> Vita 415, Contra Ap. I. 48. <sup>23</sup> J. J. V. 362. <sup>24</sup> J. J. V. 541. <sup>25</sup> Contra Ap. I. 49. <sup>26</sup> Vita 419. <sup>27</sup> Vita 421. <sup>28</sup> Vita 423. <sup>29</sup> Vita 422. <sup>30</sup> J. J. VII. 450. <sup>31</sup> Vita 425. <sup>32</sup> J. J. I. 3. <sup>33</sup> Contra Ap. I. 50. <sup>34</sup> J. J. VII. 158-161. <sup>35</sup> Vita 427. <sup>36</sup> in 94 A.D.



the Creation to the outbreak of the Roman-Jewish war.<sup>37</sup> Shortly afterwards the "Contra Apionem" was written (this is proved by a mention of the "Antiquities"<sup>38</sup>), which was a defence of Judaism against its detractors, of whom Apion was one. The name of the book is misleading, and not that of Josephus, but it has been universally known as such.

There are several references in the Antiquities to a work on the "Essence of God," and the "Laws of the Jews:"<sup>39</sup> these repeated references prove that it was no idle dream, but a serious resolve. It may be reasonably conjectured that he was working on this theme when a history of the Jewish War written by his former antagonist, Justus of Tiberias, appeared. To judge from Josephus' statements it was deficient in many respects, and especially in its interpretation of the sources and evidence: most important for Josephus is that this new publication attacked his whole conduct in Galilee, calling him a traitor and a tyrant and casting the responsibility for the outbreak of the war upon him - in fact opening up the old quarrel after a lapse of over thirty years. Not unnaturally Josephus was perturbed, because such a work might be very dangerous to his <sup>literary fame</sup> ~~position~~ in Rome, and therefore needed refuting immediately. This Josephus did, abandoning any projects on hand. His defence is contained in the Vita, which is not an autobiography in the real sense, being chiefly concerned with those six months in Galilee. It was added as an appendix to the Antiquities and since it contains a reference to the death of Agrippa II,<sup>40</sup> who died in 100 A.D., and since the "War" of Justus<sup>41</sup> itself was not published in Agrippa II's lifetime,<sup>42</sup> Josephus' Vita must have been written soon after that date.

This was Josephus' last work. The rest is silence. We do not know how successful his reply to Justus was; we do not know when he died. It is generally assumed that he died soon after, when roughly seventy years old, without publishing his work on the Essence of God, and the Laws. It may be that the violence of Justus' attack accelerated the death of the ageing Josephus - but that is mere conjecture.

<sup>37</sup> Ant. x. 267. <sup>38</sup> Contra Ap. I. 54. <sup>39</sup> e.g. Ant. x. 268. <sup>40</sup> Vita 65. <sup>41</sup> Sic Photine. Biblioth. cod. 33.

<sup>42</sup> Vita 359.

He was survived by three sons, Hyrcanus born in 72 A.D., Justus in 75 A.D., and Agrippas in 77 A.D.,<sup>44</sup> and had married at least three times. Shortly after Jotapata, he married one of the captive women from Caesarea, from whom he was soon divorced:<sup>44</sup> but when he accompanied Vespasian to Alexandria he married a lady from Alexandria.<sup>45</sup> After the revolt of Cyrene (73 A.D.) and the unsuccessful attack on Josephus, he divorced this wife by whom he had three children, of whom Hyrcanus alone survived him,<sup>46</sup> and married a Jewess from Crete who became the mother of Justus and Simonides called Agrippas.<sup>47</sup> Apparently his married life was not very happy. After his death, Eusebius says<sup>48</sup> that a statue was set up to his memory and his works were put into the library at Rome - a graceful gesture by his adopted city. Certain it is that the city of his birth did not thus honour him. He was no outstanding character: he had not the ~~absorbing~~<sup>commanding</sup> personality of a Pericles, or the genius of a Thucydides, but belonged to the less fortunate and more numerous mediocrities: an impressionable youth convinced by contact with Rome's grandeur, of the futility of opposition to it, yet shortly afterwards the leader of a stubborn resistance to an overwhelmingly superior force; a faithful follower of Agrippa II and the Roman Emperors of his time, yet capable of hating, with all the fierce animosity of which the Oriental nature is alone capable; a Jewish priest of high rank, proud of his noble birth, and so vain in his pride that he became arrogant, yet a freedman of the Roman Emperor and at times perforce a flatterer amid a court of flatterers; an egoist whose pre-occupation with self marred no doubt his domestic happiness, yet a staunch protagonist of Judaism, unstinting in his efforts on its behalf; a scion of the royal Hasmonean house, yet at his death an exile from his native land; honoured after death by the land of his adoption, yet spurned as a traitor by his fellow-countrymen - such was Flavius Josephus.

<sup>43</sup> Vilā 5. <sup>44</sup> Vilā 415. <sup>45</sup> Vilā 415. <sup>46</sup> Vilā 426. <sup>47</sup> Vilā 427. <sup>48</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccl. III 9

NOTE ON VITA, 10 - 12.

As the text stands, there is a slight confusion here. At the age of 16, Josephus determined to obtain knowledge of the Sects by personal experience (10). He disciplined himself and "passed through the three Sects" (11). It is thus hard to see how he could have spent three years in the desert with Banus (12).

The difficulty would be removed by reading  $\text{אל' חמשה}$  (i.e. all three) for  $\text{אל' חמשה}$  (12).

## JOSEPHUS IN GALILEE.

Except for the six fateful months during which he was in Galilee, the whole of Josephus' career is fairly certain. It is known that he was in Galilee, but for what purpose and in what capacity, whether official or otherwise, is much disputed. On these problems depend the answers to the questions - 'Did Josephus foment war against Rome?', 'did he disobey orders from Jerusalem?', 'why did he rebel against Rome?' Omitting all disputed evidence throughout the whole period, there are two facts which are absolutely certain, and they must form the basis of any consideration of the rest. The first is that in 63 A.D., Josephus went to Rome on a mission to obtain the release of some priests imprisoned by the procurator Felix, and returned very favourably impressed with the imposing grandeur of the Roman Empire, as exemplified in what was then the centre not only of the Empire, but of the known world: war against Rome he was convinced was futile. The second is that at the end of his stay in Galilee, Josephus was fighting against the Romans, being besieged by them for forty-seven days in Jotapata before the town was taken, and the besieged either slain or forced to surrender. To infer from this that Josephus was consistently opposed to Rome throughout his career is entirely unjustified in view of his living in Rome for the latter part of his life. Thus, to begin with, the two hypotheses from which it is alone possible to work, are apparently contradictory, and the problem is to explain the interval which elapsed between the first and the second in such a way that a coherent picture is given not only of the intervening months, but also of the hypotheses.

To take the first fact then: Josephus returns from Rome a pacifist, to find Judaea in a state of ferment. Intermittent trouble had been the rule in Judaea ever since the death of Herod the Great, and even, before that: peace was unusual. Herod's sons did not rule well over the tetrarchies which Augustus allowed them to administer, so that Judaea was attached to the Roman province of Syria, under procurators, beginning with Coponius, until Florus, (64 - 66 A.D.) except for

6 A.D. of J.T.II. 117.



Agrippa I, set up by Claudius (41 - 44 A.D.) Odd as it may seem with the improved Imperial civil service instituted under the Emperors, and responsible to the Emperor immediately or ultimately, Judaea seems to have been singularly unfortunate in its procurators. The country had after all been the battle-ground of Ptolemy and Seleucid for generations, and the Jews were, in Roman eyes, of a peculiar temperament, and had peculiar customs and religion, yet, Rome's hand was generally weak, and when it was strong, it was wielded with undue severity. In Florus, whom Josephus returned to find as procurator, the climax of all this seemed to be centred. Nor even were the Jews at one with each other: religious and political sects abounded:<sup>2</sup> there were numerous false-prophets: some favoured the descendants of Herod the Great, others hated them. Judaea was thus a house divided against itself, and the Roman procurators were not the best for ruling this turbulent country.<sup>3</sup> To this then Josephus returned, convinced of the futility of war against Rome. The attack of Florus shortly afterwards upon the Temple Treasures was one of the immediate causes of the revolution. Cestius Gallus, proconsul of Syria, hurried to the scene, but was unaccountably defeated at Bethhoron. The victory did the Jews more harm than good, in that they were liable to become more self-confident: ~~the~~ Romans merely became determined. It is hard to imagine pacifist doctrines - however justified by later events - being listened to at such an hour.

Yet Josephus now goes to Galilee. He himself has two accounts: in the earlier one,<sup>4</sup> he is portrayed as an officially appointed general, for the further conducting of hostilities against Rome: the later one is contradictory. There,<sup>5</sup> Josephus was sent "with two other priests Joazar and Judas .... to induce the disaffected to lay down their arms ...." i.e. it was a mission of peace. Obviously one of these accounts is not entirely true. The B. J. was written under Roman auspices soon after the war was ended, when Josephus was anxious to remain in favour with Vespasian, Titus and Agrippa, and so

<sup>2</sup> See Josephus' accounts of Essenes, Sadducees, Pharisees, and Zealots: B. J. II. 119-166: Ant. XVIII. 11-25.

<sup>3</sup> The 'sicarii' were a constant source of trouble: cf. Ant. XI, Passim. <sup>4</sup> B. J. II. 562-568.

<sup>5</sup> Vita 28f.

he probably deemed it inopportune to give the whole truth, especially in such a controversial and distasteful matter, involving himself. The Vita was occasioned by an attack from his old enemy, Justus of Tiberias, on the very subject of the "command" in Galilee: in the Vita<sup>6</sup> Josephus admits the suppression of some facts hitherto: "I will mention," he says, "things passed over till now": so too,<sup>7</sup> "it is necessary I think, to write down as well now all events in my career which I did not narrate in the Jewish War". And so, the Vita seems to approach nearer to the actual truth: the suspicion that the B.J. contains only half the truth is confirmed. It is reasonable on other grounds that the Vita should be nearer the truth. Justus had, we know, attacked Josephus particularly on his work in Galilee: Josephus replies in the Vita, dealing almost exclusively with those six months, and expanding the necessarily short statements of the B.J., which are so apt to give a false impression. The B.J. account as such is to be rejected on general considerations also. Josephus had had no experience as a general, and his views were totally averse to war with Rome; such a man would not have been seriously chosen for the conduct of organised warfare - the war would thus have been foredoomed to failure. The B.J. account further assumes that the Jewish government embodied in the Sanhedrim was eager for war. Josephus' accounts show, and general considerations confirm him, that the Sanhedrim was opposed to war at that time. The priestly-class in Jerusalem owed their position to Rome, whose governor appointed the High-Priest at will, and Agrippa and the Herodians had always made loyalty to Rome the main point of their policy. Josephus<sup>8</sup> puts into the mouth of Agrippa a speech which outlines their general policy of favouring Rome. The Sanhedrin and the priests did not as yet want war, or rather they did all in their power to stop it.<sup>9</sup> And so, we may say that the B.J. account of the appointment is only partly true.

Josephus then went to Galilee on this mission to pacify the disaffected. Galilee was over-run with powerful bands of sicarii, who believed that their ideal of liberty was to be obtained by

<sup>6</sup> Vita 338, 339. <sup>7</sup> Vita 413. <sup>8</sup> J. S. II. 345-404. <sup>9</sup> Cf. Vita 17-19, Ant. 123.



murdering their enemies. They had not originated recently, for Roman procurators had tried to deal with them for years, but they could not stamp them out, and they continued to vex Romans and Jews alike. The frequent mention of robbers in the Vita and the relevant parts of the B.J., shows clearly the opposition which Josephus encountered from them. His chief individual opponents were John of Gischala and Justus of Tiberias; but the accounts of John of Gischala present a further difficulty: the B.J. paints a very black picture of John as crafty, treacherous, deceitful, so that it is hard to find a redeeming feature in him. On the other hand, the account in the Vita says<sup>11</sup> that he attempted to hold back his people from rebellion against Rome, "but was unsuccessful, although very enthusiastic", and then collected a band of men, defeated the surrounding tribes who were attacking Gischala, and finally rebuilt his home-town more solidly than before. Apparently here then, John is commended for his desire and efforts to prevent an anti-Roman rising in the same way as Josephus: if this is true, the B.J. account cannot be right. The B.J. account is certainly very black, being influenced perhaps by the fact that Josephus wrote the B.J. for the Romans. John, however, judging from the whole account of the B.J. and Vita, was one of Rome's bitterest enemies, and although the B.J. may be influenced by personal feeling, the main outline of the account of John is right. When the Vita sections are carefully noted, and taken with the account of his subsequent career in the Vita, they cannot make us seriously believe that John like Josephus desired ardently to suppress an anti-Roman rising. He may for a short time have appeared to be opposing the rebels against Rome, but the rebuilding of the walls of Gischala is significant of his normal anti-Roman feelings.<sup>12</sup> Further, there was a long interval between the composition of the B.J. and that of the Vita, which also may account for the apparent discrepancy. Circumstances changed and possibly even opinions, and, what is more important, the high feeling

<sup>10</sup> B.J. II. 585ff. <sup>11</sup> Vita 43-45. <sup>12</sup> Vita 45.

which ran during and immediately after the war may have been felt no longer in that form. And so slight differences in detail may <sup>have</sup> been made in the 'Vita' account, but nevertheless the general impression of Josephus' normal ~~appear, without the general impression of the whole being~~ <sup>hostility to Rome</sup> ~~no interpreted~~ changes from both B.J. and Vita.

Was Josephus then successful in disarming Galilee, with such opponents as John of Gischala? The B.J. does not mention this pacific mission so that it cannot be taken as a judge here. The Vita says it was unsuccessful. <sup>13</sup>"Seeing that it would be impossible to disarm the robbers, I persuaded the people to pay them as mercenaries" - a very feeble expedient indeed, and unworthy of a general - "for I wanted peace at ~~any~~ <sup>any</sup> price in Galilee". <sup>14</sup> His two colleagues depart also. <sup>15</sup> The exact reason for this - whether they disagreed with Josephus' policy, or realised the futility of their mission, is not known; what does seem certain, however, according to the Vita is that about this time an attempt was made to supersede Josephus. Several incidents must have been open to misinterpretation. Josephus had kept the corn in Upper Galilee "either for the Romans or for my own use." <sup>16</sup> So too with the spoils from the raid on the <sup>17</sup> baggage of the wife of Ptolemaeus, steward of Agrippa. Josephus dallied and the "robbers" said that by keeping instead of dividing the spoils, he was acting as a tyrant, and the supporters of Rome suspected Josephus also. And so, John sent a request to Jerusalem that Josephus should be removed. <sup>18</sup> A deputation of four was sent to supersede him and set up John in his stead, but Josephus outwitted them. This deputation is important in that it proves that the High Priest was now in favour of war, seeing that he desired to appoint John. In all probability Josephus was up-to-date with news from home (this may be one of the incidental reasons why he always was within reach of the big towns), and hearing of the change of attitude, decided that the only way to keep his position was to change sides. The events mentioned above seem to suggest that he had been playing a waiting game for some time. It is important that he mentions his first skirmish with the Roman forces under Placidus, <sup>19</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Vita 77 ff. <sup>14</sup> Vita 78. <sup>15</sup> Vita 77. <sup>16</sup> Vita 42. <sup>17</sup> Vita 126 ff. - the B.J. account differs in detail. <sup>18</sup> Vita 190. <sup>19</sup> Vita 213.



"pretending to fight against him", before he says "about this time it was that Jonathan and his legates came",<sup>20</sup> - i.e. Josephus had thus definite proof of anti-Roman action to lay before them. The result was that the people of Jerusalem, by now changed in their attitude, "confirmed my command of Galilee",<sup>21</sup> and his position as head of the opposing forces was officially regularised.

From henceforth Josephus was in his right to attack the Romans, and was not acting "ultra vires". Any attacks on the Romans before (Placidus) were perhaps technically ultra vires, according to the terms of the original commission. The B.J. account seems to have omitted all the intricate and disputed steps by which Josephus finally became the official leader of the opposition to Rome and stated bluntly that he was leader at the beginning. It is then only partly true: but a statement such as exists in the B.J. would be sufficient both for the Romans under whose auspices he was writing (they would only remember him from Jotapata) and for an entire history of the war in so far as Josephus played an active part in it.

Vespasian now appeared in Galilee, and there is no further dispute as to the side for which Josephus was fighting at Jotapata: We thus arrive at the second of the hypotheses from which we started. His change of policy after his position was regularised may be indicated further by the fact that most of the army of volunteers who came to him when he first went to Galilee on a mission of peace deserted him when he shut himself up in Jotapata:<sup>22</sup> the reason may have been partly fear and partly discontent with the new policy their leader had adopted, seeing that they themselves still favoured peace at all costs.<sup>23</sup>

What then drove Josephus into the position of a rebel against Rome? The prevalence and influence of the sicarii in Judaea has been already noticed, and the abundant references in Josephus elsewhere,<sup>24</sup> suggest that it was they who were for the most part responsible. The immediate cause, as is the case with so many other wars, was a powerful minority. Such bands of men could easily force

<sup>20</sup> Vilā 216. <sup>21</sup> Vilā 310 <sup>22</sup> B.J. III. 129, 130. <sup>23</sup> cf. Vilā 78 <sup>24</sup> c.f. Ant. xx. 186 ff.

the hands of a government which was admittedly weak.<sup>25</sup> Josephus indeed says in so many words, "the war against the Romans was not free choice, but rather compulsion",<sup>26</sup> and, "the robbers aroused the people to war against the Romans".<sup>27</sup> But this is not to say that the sicarii were wholly responsible, nor does Josephus intend to give this impression if we may judge from his strictures on Florus.<sup>28</sup> The great influence they could command by their forces and terrorism, combined with the result of the battle at Bethhoron, must all have gone to their support. Then also at the time of John's embassy to Jerusalem to procure the removal of Josephus, there is evidence that the High Priest had joined the war party openly: it was not exactly unprecedented for priests to have to do with rebels,<sup>29</sup> during the ~~(struggle of)~~ <sup>fends between</sup> the high-priests <sup>and</sup> ~~(with)~~ the priests. Such factors as these forced the hands of the Sanhedrin and Josephus too, when he saw that the only way to get his position regularised and not to be superseded was to throw in his lot against Rome. However, we must say that Josephus did not foment war against Rome: he was seeking peace with Rome except for the latter part of his stay in Galilee, and even then, his opposition resembled rather the passive resistance of a besieged commander than the active energetic offensive of a spirited rebel-chieftain. In so far as Josephus at first tried unsuccessfully to pacify Galilee, and later fought Placidus before his command against Rome had been confirmed, there is no alternative but to say that Josephus did exceed his original instructions, by anticipating his new orders, issued afterwards. Thus far John's accusation that he was aiming at a "tyranny" was right, but it was only for a short time, and opposition to Rome at Jotapata was well within the bounds of his new commission.

Josephus thus stands convicted of inconsistency in Galilee, if the foregoing account is plausible, but in fairness to him we have had to take into account the forces which combined to force his own hands, and the people of Jerusalem. And there emerges thus the conclusion that Josephus was not the man to die a martyr to his original steadfast  
<sup>25</sup> c.g. Ant. xx. 208-210 <sup>26</sup> Vita 27. <sup>27</sup> Ant. xx. 172 - written after 90 A.D., and so probably his considered opinion. <sup>28</sup> Ant. xx. 254. <sup>29</sup> c.g. Ant. xx. 180, 214 - each side hires bands of desperadoes.

purpose. Consistency is frequently difficult to obtain, and much more so in war-time. If a man was a staunch supporter of Roman arms, he had to observe, if he judged the facts without bias, that Rome was not governing too well in Judaea: if he was a nationalist and therefore hostile to Rome, he had to admit that those who represented nationalism were using high-handed methods involving a tyranny worse than that which they sought to suppress: if he wanted to steer a middle course between the two parties taking the best of the ideals of both, he was immediately suspected by both parties and dubbed traitor. So with Josephus: his nationalist opponents called him a traitor: his friends in the Roman camp were not sure of his fidelity, and ascribed reverses to his treachery. To say, with Laqueur, that the traitor Josephus deliberately set out to betray his fatherland into the hands of the enemy is incorrect, because that "traitor", so-called, while subsequently becoming a Roman citizen and a freedman of Vespasian, yet worked unceasingly for the Jews and the best type of Judaism. His later life acquits him of the charge of treachery. As a historian, we must say that in his B.J. account he is guilty, to a degree, of 'suppressio veri.' Farther than that we have no justification in going.

Laqueur's view of the "Rechenschaftsbericht", and Josephus.

Laqueur holds that the Vita of Josephus which we possess was not actually composed after 100 A.D., but only worked up then from the 'Rechenschaftsbericht', the first work of Josephus, telling of events in Galilee, and written before the end of the Roman-Jewish War. The grounds on which he bases this theory are the apparent difficulties and contradictions which are to be found on a comparison between the Vita and the Bellum Judaicum, both of which deal partly with the same events.

Such a theory can be tested in a variety of ways, but unless the style of the book is so different as to allow for the possibility of some passages being early and some late in date of composition, it is at the outset disproved. And so the style is to be examined first. It so happens that in the case of Josephus this linguistic argument is particularly strong. Aramaic, not Greek, was the native language of Josephus, a Jew, and in order to speak and write Greek he had to take considerable pains, as he himself testifies. <sup>1</sup> Greek then being a language which he had to use almost entirely when he came finally <sup>2</sup> to live in Rome, we can see his development in the language, till he reaches the mature style of the "Contra Apionem". Further, the signs of the 'assistants' <sup>3</sup> whom Josephus says he employed for his work disappear in Ant. XX., and Josephus himself wrote the last pages of his 'Antiquities.' Thus the validity of Laqueur's theory of a 'Rechenschaftsbericht' depends for the most part on a comparison of the style of Ant. XX. and Vita: if passages in the Vita are found with words, constructions, or phrases similar to those in Ant. XX we can presume they were both composed by one man at the same time; if in the Vita itself the passages alleged by Laqueur to belong to the 'Report' can also be shown to have similar linguistic characteristics to Ant. XX. and the rest of the Vita, the theory of Laqueur is disproved.

1. a. In comparing the style of Ant. XX. and Vita, it is noticeable that whereas Greek is normally very strict in its use of participles, Josephus uses them in the same sentence with a change of tense, for

<sup>1</sup> Ant. xx. 263, 264. <sup>2</sup> His journey to Rome in 63 A.D. must have necessitated <sup>some</sup> knowledge of Greek. <sup>3</sup> Contra Ap. I. 50.



(not good in relation)

no adequate grammatical reason. e.g. Ant. XX. 215. βουλομένου . ἀπολαύων .  
 Vita 201. ἐκπορεύωνι ... λαβόντες . There are eight examples in Ant. XX.,  
 six in the Vita.

b. Participles are frequently used not well connected and subordinated. e.g. Vita 96. ὁδηγηθεὶς ... λαβόμενος ... ἐκβὰς ... διαφύγων :  
 eleven cases in Ant. XX., twenty-one in Vita; four being from Laqueur's 'Report' sections. ✓

c. Participles, particularly in genitive absolute constructions, come after the climax in the main verb, and therefore appear to hang uncoordinated. e.g. Vita. 8. μνήμη τε καὶ συνέσι δοκῶν (bad instance)  
 διαφέρων : sixteen in Ant. XX., twenty in Vita.

## 2. Josephus uses connecting particles in a peculiar way:-

(a) Sometimes he has no connecting particle at all. e.g. Ant. XX. 3.

ταῦτα αὐθόρῳ : nineteen cases in Ant. XX., thirty-four in Vita, with two from Laqueur's sections.

(b) Sometimes he has a connecting particle. e.g. δὲ, οὖν, τε, which is not of itself entirely adequate: twenty-one cases in Ant. XX; sixty-seven in Vita, eleven of which are from Laqueur's 'Report'.

(c) He puts his connecting particle out of its usual place, sometimes even fifth word in the sentence. e.g. τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ  
 ἰωνίου δέ - Vita. 262. 12 cases in Ant. XX; 44 in Vita, including two from Laqueur's 'early sections.'

3. (a) The use of the pluperfect and perfect tenses in place of the more usual aorist is frequent: in Ant. XX. it occurs 12 times; in Vita 51, 5 of which are from the 'early sections'.

(b) The imperfect tense is used where there is no inceptive or conative meaning: 3 cases are found in Ant. XX., and 20 in Vita, including 2 from the 'early' sections.

## 4. Negatives are also used in an unusual way.

The negative μή instead of the οὐ of Classical Greek; the forms καὶ μή, καὶ οὐ are also found, instead of μήτε, οὐδέ: 7 cases in Ant. XX: 23 in Vita: 2 from Laqueur's 'early' sections.

5. A tendency to abstract ways of expression is also to be noticed. 29 cases in Ant. XX; 36 in Vita, including 3 from the 'early' sections.

6. Verbs, pronouns and nouns are frequently inserted where Classical Greek would idiomatically omit them: 7 cases in Ant. XX; 14 in Vita, 2 being from the "early" sections.
7. The Infinitive noun is also frequently found, likewise 'constructiones ad sensum'. e.g. Ant. XX. III. τὸ ἀγῆθος θεωροῦμενον, καὶ φεβηθέν, νομίζοντες . . . . . Of these 4 are in Ant. XX; and 11 in Vita, including one from the "early" sections.

These then are the characteristics of Josephus' style in Ant. XX and Vita. Considering the fact that the Vita is longer than Ant. XX., and that the total number of Laqueur's alleged early passages amounts to forty-two sections in all, the proportion is fairly equal. Taken together, the cumulative force of all these instances is to show that Ant. XX. and the Vita were written not only by the same man, but at the same time, and 94 A.D. is the earliest date that can be assigned to the Antiquities. Of every main characteristic in the examination of the style, the sections in Vita alleged by Laqueur to belong to the Rechenschaftsbericht, also have examples. Vita 96 (a "Report" section) provides a particularly striking instance, καὶ ἐνταρξάντων, εἰ μὴ --- ἀφικόμενον: Vita 262 has the identical construction and almost the identical words, with καὶ ἐνταρξάντων πύργων, εἰ μὴ --- ἐξελόμενον. Similarly we may notice Ant. XX. 182. --- ἂν εἰδένωκε, εἰ μὴ --- συνεχώρησε, and Vita 243 καὶ εἰδένωκες ἂν, εἰ μὴ --- ἐψύλαξεν: also the phrase μετ' ἀποδηκῆς (Vita 163 - an "early" section) is identical with that in Ant. XX. 29.

The argument from the language is enough to convince us that Laqueur is wrong. And yet, the consideration of style is one which Laqueur omits entirely, although it is the one on which his theory, especially in the circumstances of Josephus, stands or falls. ~~(any support which)~~ <sup>doubtless</sup> Laqueur would allege from Josephus himself ~~(to)~~ in support <sup>of</sup> the 'Rechenschaftsbericht' theory, ~~(would be)~~ a passage similar to B.J. III. 138. 139, where Josephus says he sent a dispatch to Jerusalem explaining events in Galilee. But even allowing that such a dispatch was later incorporated into the Vita, it would be



written originally in Aramaic: this was the native language, and we cannot imagine a report going to Jerusalem from a Jew in a foreign language. The "report" in Aramaic would thus be comparable to the Aramaic B.J., later translated into Greek, which we now possess. To say that this early "report" was written in Greek is impossible as has been shown on linguistic grounds; so that the only alternative is to say that it was in Aramaic. In that form Thackeray thinks the theory "unobjectionable and not improbable." But Laqueur himself rejects all possibility of an Aramaic <sup>c</sup>Rechenschaftsbericht.

Along with this theory, which is untenable in the way Laqueur presents it, and tenable only on a hypothesis which Laqueur rejects, Laqueur discredits Josephus as a man and as a historian, calling him in effect a scoundrel and a falsifier of events. No one could reasonably deny that Josephus is inferior to Thucydides as a historian, but he has to be given credit for his motives in writing history. Josephus' ideal in the B.J., which Justus later attacked and thus caused Josephus to write the Vita as a counter-attack, is impartiality.- B.J.I.9. "However I will not go to the other extreme, out of opposition to those men who extol the Romans, nor will I determine to raise the actions of my countrymen too high; but I will prosecute the actions of both parties with accuracy". So too B.J.I.30 - I wrote "for those who love the truth." The concluding words of the B.J. are in the same vein,- "I shall not scruple to say, and that boldly, that truth has been what I have alone aimed at throughout its entire composition."- B.J.VII. 455: so too Vita 336. 337. 338 & 339, especially, "for it is necessary for the writer of history to be truthful." Such are the ideals which he attempted to follow in the composition of his history. The passages, and the general impression which the whole of the history gives, are thus diametrically opposed to Laqueur. If he has noticed them at all, he has omitted them as being vain words. ~~(and useless)~~

Has Josephus thus carried out those ideals which he set

before himself ? <sup>The answer</sup> This depends on whether we have any means of testing Josephus' account. Dealing as he does in the Antiquities with the history of the Jews from the Creation to the Roman-Jewish War, it is difficult to find an account which Josephus did not himself use for his work. But with the procurators of Judaea for example, he can be occasionally tested from Tacitus and the accounts agree. Where the accounts do not agree with that of Josephus on Judaea, most authorities to-day follow Josephus, as being the most reliable. In his account of the murder of Gaius and the accession of Claudius (Ant. XIX.) he is followed implicitly, his being the only account which is reliable and in any detailed form. His description of the Roman Army and its formation in the B.J., is recognised as a "locus classicus" by students of the Roman military system. Josephus as a historian can be trusted, and is so; for whenever we can test him he stands the test. In spite of Laqueur, The B.J. is the best and most reliable account of the Jewish War: he had all the requirements necessary for a student of it, he had been present at the War, in honourable captivity; he had access to the official records in Rome, after the War, including the commentarii of the Emperors, and the public monuments; he quotes decrees which are certainly not forgeries, but were preserved on the Capitol for anyone to see; he uses authorities recognised as reliable in his day, among whom were Nicholas<sup>a</sup> of Damascus, Strabo, Philo - these he mentions by name. And yet Laqueur says he is unreliable and a falsifier of facts. He seems to be confusing the narration of facts and the interpretation of them. He disagrees with Josephus' interpretation of facts, particularly in the B.J., and Vita, and says Josephus falsifies facts. The interpretation may be different with different persons, but the fact itself remains: it is the historian's task primarily to relate facts and then to interpret them correctly, but because we cannot agree with the interpretation, we are not therefore justified in condemning the historian as worthless, as Laqueur does.



The main problem with which Laqueur deals is Vita 36-45, and the corresponding account in the B.J. This immediately brings up the question of Josephus' tenure of office in Galilee, whether it was constitutional or unconstitutional. Unfortunately Josephus could not equal Thucydides in putting himself in the background, and acting as an impartial judge. He is at his worst when dealing with himself: nor was he the type of man to say merely "it befell me to be an exile from my native land"; rather would he give the reason for it, and his own opinion whether it was a just sentence or not. When Justus attacked Josephus' B.J. and his command in Galilee, by bringing out another history of the War, Josephus could not resist defending himself, and did so chiefly by attacking Justus - hence the Vita, which is an autobiography in name only. We have indeed to admit that Josephus writing of himself is not at his best; whether this is because he has no firm ground to stand on, or because he was liable to allow his feelings to override his saner judgement, or partly because of both, does not here concern us. Laqueur has no valid reason to say, however, that he has no value as a historian. Josephus is not a wholesale liar as he suggests. It has been admitted that Josephus, when dealing with himself, leaves something to be desired; but admitting, for a moment, even that his account of Galilee in B.J. and Vita is a clever attempt to gloze over the real events with untruth - a theory not often held - we are by no means justified in saying that as a historian and as a man, Josephus is a complete and entire scoundrel. Laqueur has taken that part of the history where the historian is at his worst; he has taken the most debatable year of the historian's life (involving ultimately the question of war-guilt) and interpreted them in the worst light possible, and he assumes that the rest of his work is all similar to this his mistaken opinion of the Vita and B.J. In fact Laqueur's whole motive in his study of Josephus, seems to be to discredit the historian: his view of Josephus is narrow and wrong.

(Note on the descriptions of John of Gischala in B.J.II. 585 ff.  
and Vita. 43 - 45.)

In the B.J. John of Gischala is described in the blackest of terms, as crafty, treacherous, deceitful: the Vita says he attempted to restrain his fellow-citizens from rebellion against Rome, but was unsuccessful. He therefore collected a band of followers, defeated the neighbouring tribes who were attacking Gischala, and finally rebuilt its walls. The impression may be given by this that John is commended for his desire to suppress an anti-Roman rising in the same way as Josephus. The B.J. is probably influenced by personal feeling immediately after the War, and by the fact that the B.J. was written for the Romans: judging from his subsequent career John was one of Rome's bitterest enemies. Allowing for these considerations then, the B.J. account is on the whole correct. When the Vita account is carefully noted, it cannot make us seriously believe that John always wanted to suppress an anti-Roman rising. He may for a short time have opposed rebellion against Rome, but the rebuilding of the walls of Gischala shows his normal anti-Roman tendency. Further, there was a long interval between the composition of the B.J. and the Vita. As time went on, and antagonistic feelings abated, Josephus in the Vita was probably willing to give John a little credit which in the B.J. he refused to give him. Details differ, but the general impression of the B.J. remains the same in the Vita, and still correct. (cf. Ant. VI. 262 - condemnation of Saul for slaying the priests: and Ant. VI. 344 - a description of his heroic death.)



Epaphroditus - the publisher of some of Josephus' works.

The earliest historians had no one to publish their works, so that the initiative and any expenses incurred rested entirely upon them. Herodotus, "the father of History", wrote under these conditions, as did Thucydides. Yet under the later Roman Republic it became the fashion for a writer to have a publisher: Atticus acted in this capacity for Cicero. Professional scribes also arose. Augustus gathered a literary circle around him and gave his Imperial patronage to men of letters. This custom still prevailed under the Flavians when Josephus wrote.

His first published work, the "Jewish War", was officially inspired, and perhaps sponsored by the Roman government, and there is not any mention of a publisher for this very reason. But in his next work, the "Jewish Antiquities", he says that the man who encouraged him most to take up his pen was Epaphroditus,<sup>2</sup> "a man who is a lover of all kinds of learning, but is principally delighted with the knowledge of history; and this on account of his having been himself concerned in great affairs, and many turns of fortune, and having shown a wonderful vigour of an excellent nature, and an immovable virtuous resolution in them all. I yielded to this man's persuasions, who always excites such as have abilities in what is useful and acceptable, to join their endeavours with his". So the "Antiquities" was inspired by Epaphroditus: at the end of the Vita, which was added to the Antiquities and intended to be a part of it, he dedicates the whole of the work to Epaphroditus, "most excellent of men."<sup>3</sup>

So too, the opening words of his last work, the "Contra Apionem", so-called, address the same person Epaphroditus "most <sup>Excellent</sup> ~~noble~~ sir",<sup>4</sup> and the work ends with a dedication to him, "a most ardent lover of the truth."<sup>5</sup>

This Epaphroditus then was evidently Josephus' publisher as well. Josephus' first work was not published under him because it was a semi-official manifesto, but the others were under his care, and in places it is possible to pick out sections which do the double

<sup>1</sup> It has been suggested that it was not Atticus, but all agree that Cicero had a publisher. <sup>2</sup> Ant. I.8: *ἱκανὸς ὡρίστων*. <sup>3</sup> Vita 430. <sup>4</sup> Contra Ap. I. 1. *ἡρώτατος ἀνδρῶν* - he was then perhaps an *ἐπὶ*. <sup>5</sup> Contra Ap. II.296.

duty of a table of contents and an advertisement. (e.g. Ant.XX.259: XX.267 - a reminder of intended publications for the benefit of interested readers.)

Taking this evidence from Josephus, it is necessary to try <sup>to find</sup> and identify Epaphroditus. Two persons of that name are known. Firstly, there is the Epaphroditus who was a freedman and secretary of Nero, executed under Domitian<sup>6</sup> (81-96 A.D.) Secondly, Suidas mentions a Greek grammarian of that name who came to live in Rome from Alexandria, and was the possessor of a large library. Coming from Alexandria he was not unnaturally interested particularly in Homer and the poets. He lived in Rome in the time of Nero until the reign of Nerva 96-98 A.D., according to Suidas. The possibility that the former of these is to be identified with the Epaphroditus in Josephus, seems remote, because the descriptions do not tally. The Epaphroditus Domitian put to death would not be "a lover of learning", "delighted with the knowledge of history", "most excellent of men", or "most <sup>excellent</sup> ~~noble~~ sir". Rather is he to be identified with Epaphroditus "the grammarian", mentioned by Suidas, to whom these epithets could with justice be applied. His views would exactly correspond with those of Josephus: ~~his~~ was "a lover of truth", and Josephus says explicitly that truth is indispensable for the historian.<sup>7</sup>

The recondite allusions in the Contra Apionem to Homer (e.g. did the Greeks of whom Homer tells know the alphabet?<sup>8</sup>; and the question,<sup>9</sup> "Is the word νόμος found in Homer?"), and the suggestion as to the origin of the Homeric poems,<sup>10</sup> which inspired Wolf's Prolegomena, are all important evidence to support the identification with Epaphroditus the grammarian from Alexandria of the Epaphroditus in Josephus. Josephus would have access to his publishers library: indeed the Contra Apionem is precisely the type of work which would need a large library for reference.

At what dates then did Josephus dedicate works to Epaphroditus? Josephus, having a publisher, may well have changed

<sup>6</sup> Tac. Annals. xv. 55: Suet. Nero. 49. <sup>7</sup> Vita 339. <sup>8</sup> Contra Ap. I. 11 cf. ἡμέτεροι λόγοι

<sup>9</sup> II. 154 <sup>10</sup> I. 12.



his works in some details in various editions after a few years had elapsed since the first edition. Proof of this is found in the Antiquities: there are two separate endings: firstly, "and here my Antiquities shall cease";<sup>11</sup> secondly, "with this I will end my Antiquities";<sup>12</sup> "this is the thirteenth year of Domitian Caesar". (i.e. 94 A.D.) In the Vita, however,<sup>13</sup> Agrippa II is assumed dead, so that this appendix must have been written after 100 A.D., the date which Photius<sup>14</sup> gives for the death of Agrippa. For the Vita then to be an integral part of the Antiquities, which it was undoubtedly meant to be, there must have been another edition of the Antiquities after 100 A.D., when the Vita was added to it. In the second edition however, the concluding passage of the first was left, whether intentionally or through an oversight. It is not improbable too that considerable changes were made in this second edition. There is evidence of a change of attitude by Josephus towards the members of Herod's house,<sup>15</sup> and since Agrippa II died in 100 A.D., he may have felt himself free to express his own studied convictions openly, and therefore inserted them in the second edition. That Josephus should change his opinion in the thirty years which had elapsed between the "Jewish War" (c. 75 A.D.) and the Vita (after 100 A.D.) is not unnatural, taking into account also the changed circumstances: he stands guilty of suppressio veri perhaps, but for his ultimate sincerity he is to be commended. The peculiarities of style in Ant. XVII-XIX may perhaps be accounted for by saying that they were introduced for the second edition: Josephus, attacked by Justus, defended himself by attacking Justus in the Vita, and at the same time perhaps worked up Ant. XVII-XIX, in order to outdo Justus. Whatever the purpose or origin of the style in these books, the innovation is by no means pleasing or successful. Of the fact of the second edition of the Antiquities then there seems little doubt; it is the nature and extent of the innovations which are debatable. The first edition of the Antiquities then was about 94 A.D., and the second, with the Vita, after 100 A.D.

<sup>11</sup> Ant. x. 259. <sup>12</sup> Ant. x. 264. <sup>13</sup> Vita 359. <sup>14</sup> Phot. Biblioth. 33. <sup>15</sup> 16th year of Trajan.

<sup>15</sup> e.g. end of Ant. xvi.

The Antiquities, Vita, and the Contra Apionem are dedicated to Epaphroditus, and the Contra Apionem was written at least after the Antiquities which is mentioned as one of his completed works: perhaps between the first and second editions of the Antiquities.

Assuming then that Epaphroditus the grammarian is the Epaphroditus to whom Josephus refers, because of these reasons, we can, with the evidence in Suidas arrive at the following conclusions about him. He was from Chaeronea, says Suidas, as was Plutarch also. They were nearly contemporaries, but it is doubtful whether they knew one another, Plutarch being born about 50 A.D., roughly the time when Epaphroditus entered the service of Modestus. So that any mention of him in Plutarch is unlikely.

"He was bought by Modestus, prefect of Egypt". This sentence in Suidas is important for chronology. Modestus was prefect in the time of Claudius it is generally admitted, and Milne<sup>16</sup> puts him between L. Lusius (54 A.D.) and T. Claudius Balbillus (56 A.D.) Between 54 A.D. and 56 A.D., then, Epaphroditus was purchased as a slave. Suidas further says that he educated the prefect's son Pitelinus, so that Epaphroditus could not have been a mere child himself at the time, and we may infer from this alone that he was about twenty or twenty-five years of age in 55 A.D. Thus his birth may be put at about 30 A.D.

He went to Rome and lived there "in the time of Nero, up to Nerva". (96-98 A.D.) It was presumably fairly early in Nero's<sup>17</sup> reign (54 A.D.-69 A.D.) that Epaphroditus went to Rome; perhaps about 56 A.D. He may have returned with Modestus, who was superseded in 56 A.D., and continued to superintend the education of his charge there. Thus he lived in Rome for a period of forty years, and was ultimately freed. There is extant a statue<sup>17</sup> of a M. Metthius Epaphroditus, "grammaticus graecus"; so that his former master would be, in full, M. Metthius Modestus.<sup>18</sup>

This period of forty years was spent in collecting books,

<sup>16</sup> Milne, 'History of Egypt', App. II. <sup>17</sup> A photograph is given in R. Eisler, 'The Messianic Jesus and John the Baptist'. <sup>18</sup> See Pauly-Wissowa, Real. Enc. under Epaphroditus.



(Suidas) of which he finally had a library of 30,000;- they were "serious" in nature. He had two houses in Rome, so that his position cannot have been that of many of the "hungry Greeklings", who, if we can trust Juvenal, infested Rome about this time. Most of his money must have been made out of his publishing: the exact conditions of agreement between publisher and author are not known in this case, but to judge from the statements of Josephus about him, he seems to have had a genuine love for literature, and was not entirely absorbed in the purely mercenary side of his publishing concern.

It cannot be inferred from Suidas that Epaphroditus died in c.97 A.D. All that can with plausibility be concluded is that he was in Rome until between 96 A.D. and 98 A.D. The reason for his leaving Rome is not given, and cannot be settled by conjecture. He does not seem to have meddled in politics like his namesake. Yet Josephus mentions (Ant. I.8) his *πύλαι ἀπολύτρωσις* and his having taken part in *μεγάλους ἀγώνους*. What exactly these were must remain a mystery on the present evidence, but it is possible that a man with a comprehensive library would meet with Domitian's disfavour during the(~~reign of~~) Terror which choked the literary activities of men like Tacitus and Juvenal. It may have been some repercussions of this in Nerva's short reign which induced Epaphroditus to leave Rome. Certain it is that the known activities of his career - e.g. the education of Modestus' son, do not account for this: and, on the other hand, Josephus was perhaps being complimentary about his activities without due regard to their importance. Besides, being interested in Homer, he perhaps simply wished to go to Alexandria, which was, after all, the seat of pure scholarship on Greek Literature generally: if that was the case, no events in Rome can account for his departure.

The date of his death is uncertain. He died of dropsy, says Suidas, in his "fifth year" ( *εἰς ἑνὸς ἔτην* ). Obviously the manuscripts have a lacuna here, and something has to be supplied.

Considerations given above suggest that he was born c.30 A.D.; and he left Rome in c. 96 A.D., at the age of about sixty-five. Sixty and seventy are therefore the most probable emendations. If "sixty" is supplied, his death would fall c.90 A.D.; in which case Josephus would have dedicated the Antiquities, Contra Apionem, and Vita to a dead man. No stretch of imagination can reasonably support this. So that the surest conjecture is "seventy" at the lowest, and anything under that is impossible: thus, the Greek text of Suidas may have read originally *ὅτι καὶ ἑξήκοντα ἔτη ἐπλήθυνεν*.

On this showing, Epaphroditus, after leaving Rome, lived about ten years, perhaps in Alexandria. The main part of his life, and the most important in his career, was the forty or so years which he spent in Rome.

#### NOTE.

Suidas οὐ Ἐπαφροδίτης. (Suidas. ed. Ludolphus Kusterus. Camb. MDCCV)  
 Ἐπαφροδίτης, ἡμικύβητος, γραμματικός, Ἀρχίου τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου γραμματικοῦ  
 θεωτοῦ, καὶ ὃς ἀνέβη εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Μοδέστου, ἐκείνου Ἀιγυπτίου, καὶ  
 ἀνέβησας τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Πιτηλίνον, ἐν Ῥώμῃ διετέλεσεν ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ μέχρι  
 Νέρβα, καὶ θ' οὐ χρόνον καὶ Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Ἡρασιώτης ἦν καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοὶ  
 τῶν ὑπομαρτυρῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς. Ὡνούμενος δὲ αὐτὸς βιβλία, ἐκτίσας μυριάδας τρεῖς,  
 πύπων δὲ σαυδμίων καὶ ἀνακεχωρηκόπων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα ἦν μέγας τε καὶ μέλεις,  
 ὡς ἐλεφαντίνης. Ὡκεῖ δὲ ἐν ταῖς καλουμέναις Φαινιανοκυρίαις, δύο στήθας  
 ἀπὸ θηρίων κηρύκεως. ὃ δὲ καὶ ἑξήκοντα ἔτη ἐπλήθυνεν, ὅθεν καὶ  
 συγγραμμάτων δὲ κατέλειπεν ἱκανά.



## Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

### 1. a. His life and writings.

The known details of the life of Dionysius of Halicarnassus are meagre, and we have to rely mostly upon references in his works. But, not being the sort of man to talk over-much of himself, nor having a subject in which he himself played a part, <sup>he rarely</sup> ~~(the)~~ references to himself ~~(are few)~~. The date of his birth is usually given at about 60 B.C., when the Roman Republic was in its death-throes. He was thus born at Halicarnassus about four centuries after Herodotus, his fellow-townsmen. Nothing is known of his early life except that he became a rhetorician. He went to live in Rome, "at the time when the Civil War was brought to an end by Augustus Caesar" - i.e. about 30 B.C. The exact reason is not known, but it can be assumed with probability that it was no political one: the unique position Rome was gaining as mistress of a wide empire, and the centre of the then known world is sufficient to explain her attraction to Greeks, and more especially to Greek rhetoricians. Later, if we can trust Juvenal, the city was overcrowded with these "hungry Greeklings." We may assume then that Dionysius had an academy in Rome, where he taught rhetoric both in its original sense of the art of public speaking, and its natural corollary, of the art of composing speeches, that is style. Several of his works on style have come down: "On the Ancient Orators" is a series of six essays of which we possess three, on Lysias, Isaeus and Isocrates, and essays on Demosthenes and Thucydides, all showing experience in literary criticism. He took care when he was in Rome, he says, to learn the Roman language, in addition to the native Greek he spoke, and made himself "thoroughly acquainted with the national records". He lived then in Rome, for over twenty years<sup>2</sup>, working on material for the "Roman Antiquities", a history of Rome in twenty books, from the earliest times down to 264 B.C.<sup>3</sup> The work was published about 8 B.C.<sup>1</sup> We possess the first ten books in full, most of the eleventh, and fragments only of the rest. His purpose in writing this history was to show his gratitude to the

<sup>1</sup> *Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. I. 7.* <sup>2</sup> *op. cit., loc. cit.* <sup>3</sup> I. 81.

with that period. Modern methods of historical criticism are not those of the early Empire, and are not a fair standard of judgement.

It is in some respects unfortunate that Dionysius the historian was also a rhetorician, because men illogically expect perfection in style from those who profess the art of style. So, looking at his style in the Antiquities, and finding it not entirely without blemish, many disparaged Dionysius. He at least stood for a purer style, the movement towards the Attic revival, as against the florid, turgid Asiatic style so prevalent in his day.<sup>7</sup>

Yet Dionysius is ever a rhetorician: he is not a genius like Thucydides. A born writer needs to study style as Dionysius had certainly done; but to be a great historian, a rhetorician has to be a born writer as well. This is not disparaging Dionysius: he was no extraordinary man, but one of the more usual mediocrities: we must admire him for mastering the rules of style, and trying to apply them practically, in spite of the fact that he was not a born writer - that comparatively rare phenomenon.

## 2. Style of Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

(a) A number of poetical words and phrases are to be found, such as νῆπις, βρέτας, σκούπελος, ἐκωυλέσθαι, λιβῆς, τῆλος, ἀλιεύκοιτος, μελαινέμων, ὄγκος, ἀσπαστός, ἀμείλικτος, ἀπυκτος, ἐπὶ προθέω, βέβηλος, ξόμος, ῥόβη, φευκτωρία, θωαύω, γεγωνός, νηπιήσιος - to mention only a few. In II.38. we find the identical phrase of Aesch. Ag. 571 in ἀλιεύκτος τύχη.

(b) ῥῆμα λεγόμενα and rare and late words and phrases. For example, ψαλιδωτός only in I.68.3; ἰσοκόρυφος only in III.9.7: ἐξαρμάττω only in VI.81.4, in the metaphorical sense: ἀγήμευα I.7.3. is found elsewhere only in Plutarch and the Anthologia Palatina. ἀλλυλοκτόνος I.65.5, ἀλλυλοκτονία (I.87) elsewhere only in Moschio. ap. Stobaeum, and Philo. πλοστός (I.84.1) is likewise rare and semi-poetical.

Of late words, we may take as example κλιστερίζω (I.61), found in Diodorus and Plutarch, κλισιάδες (I.66.3 and V.39.), Plutarch and Philo. αὐτάνδρος Polybius and Apollonius Rhodius: ἀναβουαθέω (IV.11.1)

<sup>7</sup> Prof. J. Murray. 'Ancient Greek Literature'. p.321.



in Strabo: ἀχθοφορέω (IV.81.2.) in Polybius and Plutarch. Many of these are fresh compounds and combinations of classical Greek words.

(c) Abstract nouns, instead of participles e.g. I. 9. 4. φιλονεικίᾳ ὑποδοχῇ τῶν δεσφένων σιγκυσιῶς... καὶ πολιτείας μεταδόσει τοῖς... ἐν πόλει... ἰσταθήσεται, δούλων... συγχωρήσει ἀποταῖς εἴναι, πύχης τε ἀνθρώπων συνδρομῆς ἀναδιδόσει :

and XI. 59. 5. τὴν ἀντιδοχὴν τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ διαγνώσεως... ἀκούσαντες : 50 τοῦ X. 10. 5. ἐπὶ φόνσις τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ διαστάσει τῆς πόλεως.

(d) Thucydidean reminiscences. ἀναλλήτεσθαι occurs no less than seven times: the characteristic abstract noun with ἀποείσθαι as an alternative to the equivalent verb is also common, e.g. ἐκείθεν ἀποείσθαι - I. 84. 8; V. 7. 1.; φυλακὴν ἀποείσθαι II. 13. 1, for φυλάττειν. A preference is also shown for the Attic 'ττ', e.g. V. 62. τρεῖς τόντες, though this is not always the case, as shown by ἀράδοντες in X. 55. 1.

(e) There is also frequently found the use of καὶ οὐ, καὶ οὕτε, καὶ μή, καὶ μηδείς, where the classical Greek would have been οὐ, οὕτε, μή, μηδείς.

(f) Introductory particles are sometimes omitted entirely, or only inadequate connecting particles inserted; thus making the style rather rough and disconnected. The history starts abruptly thus, for example - τοὺς εἰωθότας ἀποδίδουσθαι.

(g) There is frequently found in Dionysius the use of participles in the same sentence, with an unexpected and unnecessary change of tense. e.g. I. 9. 3 - καὶ δέμεναν... σὺκεῖτι ἄρως ἐπέρων ἐξελεθύντες... ὀνομαίων ἀλλυγῆς διττῆς... ἀροσάγορεωόμενοι... ὀνομασίαν ἐπὶ σὺζοντες... ἀπὸνσι ἀρξάμενοι κληῖσθαι : I. 48. 1. ἐρῶναν ἐπαινοῦ... ἀσπέρων καὶ... ἀποκλιῶν : IV. 9. 1. μετὰ φιλίᾳ ἐξέθρεψεν οὐδὲν ἐνδεέστερον ἄγων τῶν ἐκαστοῦ πέκνων : IV. 85. 1. οὐδὲν τῶν ἄλλων φράσας ἠπαύετο τοὺς οὐτοὺς ἀρετῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπείρων τοὺς ἀσποτάτους, ἐλαύνων τοὺς ἰαυτοὺς ἀπὸ εὐπείρας, ὡς φθάνων τὴν ἀποστάσιν : V. 14. 1. διαφείδμενοι ταῦτα... καὶ εὐτρεπισάμενοι... συνείχον... συνθνήσκοντες : IX. 9. 9. ἐγκληνόντων δὲ καὶ φευγόντων : X. 7. 3. ἀροσάμενων, αἰῶν καὶ λεκτῶν καὶ αἰῶν ἄλλων ὁμοτήτα καὶ ὕβριν ἐνδεκνύμενος : X. 8. 4. τὰ κρίματα ἀποδοῦς... χωρίον ἐν ἐκείνῳ μέγαν ὑποκλεισόμενος : XI. 5. 1. θορύβου δὲ ἀπαστοῦ μετασχόντος τὸ συνέδριον καὶ τῶν μὲν αἰεσίτων ἀγανακτούντων, ἀνίσταται...

The participles frequently are not neatly subordinated, and

inadequately linked up. e.g. I.41.2. ἄγων κεκρωμένος: VI.9.5. ἴτε  
 λυβόντες καὶ ἐλπίδας ὡς ἔχοντες... ἐλευθερώσαντες... ἀποδιδόντες, οὐ περισφόμενοι,  
 γηραιὸς τε ἀμειψόμενοι: VI.81.2. ὅς τις ἀποδεχθεὶς οὗτος δυναστεῖα τῇ  
 καλουμένῃ δικτατορίᾳ πάντων πραγμάτων... ἐποίησε...: VI.92.2.  
 ἀκούσας δ' ὅτι....., μείσας τὸν ἑαυτοῦ στρατὸν... περὶ τῆς ἑγὼ τῆτον Λάρκιον  
 εἰς αὐτοῦ κατὰ κινήσας: IX.64.3. οὗς ἰδόντες..... ἀνεστρέφον ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν τὸν ἀπολοφειλόμενον  
 ἀπὸ τῆς: XI.62.4. ἀποτιθέμενοι τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας ἐγκλήματα ἀρκεκλινόμενοι  
 φίλοι γινώσκοντες.

Such in brief outline are the main characteristics of Dionysius style.

### 3. Dependence of Josephus on Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

Although Josephus does not mention any dependence on Dionysius, it is clear that the title Jewish Antiquities was copied from Roman Antiquities, and it may be that Dionysius' work inspired Josephus at the outset to write the history of his own nation in the same way. The division into twenty books is likewise copied by Josephus; the division being a deliberate one by the authors, and not arbitrarily imposed later for the convenience of copyists, as with Herodotus' history.

Given this dependence then, does a consideration of Josephus' Jewish Antiquities show traces of copying in detail, in words and phrases? Josephus' style when considered reveals much the same general characteristics as that of Dionysius, but for deciding on the actual dependence of Josephus on Dionysius, particular words and phrases are the best evidence, because some of the general points of style common to both were, to judge from other writers, becoming prevalent in Greek, and so the similarity of general characteristics does not necessarily indicate dependence. <sup>Any</sup> ~~the~~ plausibility of the theory of the use of an "assistant" in Antiquities XVII-XIX

<sup>19</sup> Contra Ap. I.50.



still

would

(with less probability, however, in XV and XVI) means that XVII-XIX cannot be cited as evidence either for or against dependence on Dionysius.

Particular instances of dependence may be tabulated thus:-

Column. I.		Column. II.	
Jos. Ant.	Dion. Hal. Rom. Ant.	Jos. Ant.	Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom.
VII. 220. ὑπόνομος	X. 53. 3.	XIV.	VI. 70.
XI. 177. θυρεός	II. 70. 3; IX. 64. 3.	8 στρατοδοτής	
XII. 42. κατὰ κράτος	III. 2. 7.	21. ἀΐζω	I. 40. 2; 40. 3.
46. 13. δραστήριος	III. 1. 3; IV. 4. 1; VIII. 13. 3, 14. 3		
46. 13. καὶ νύμφη	XI. 21.		
81 τρανοτέρας	De Comp. 22	43. ἀπερτήριον	VII. 37.
25. ὑποπυγνώνω (eply)	VI. 87; VII. 16.	231. στρατοκομίδα	VI. 44.
128 μεριωθεῖν	VIII. 61.	275 (B. I. III. 293) ὑπὸ νδρος	II. 6. 4.
170. λιτότης	VI. 96. 2.	296 εἰδίζω	IV. 5. 2.
179. ἀρεωδοκιμῶ	De Vett. Cens. 3. 1.	484. ἀπειροσμή	V. 2.
230. εὐρίκτος	III. 68.	XV.	
262. κατὰ κράτος	I. 6. V. 7. 2.	44 (cf. XV. 37) ἀναβιοθεῖν	IV. 11. 1.
269. εὐαρέστης	X. 54.	211, 388 (cf. XIX. 250) ἀδύμονος	I. 56. 5; III. 70. 3; V. 9. 3.
305. ἀρεμφοτή	III. 65. 5; IV. 61. 1.	XVI.	
315 (cf. e. g. XIII. 161)		93. εὐπηκῶ	VI. 72.
XIV. 427. XIX. 199	I. 81; 87. 3; III. 5. 2.	114. κενόσπουδός	κενοσπουδία VI. 70.
ἀπογνώσις	IX. 12. 5.	184. ἀντιμαρτυροῦμαι	I. 1.
334. ἀποσκευή	I. 52.	201. ἀροστρούμω	IV. 23, VII. 45, X. 31.
389 εὐκλεος	De Dinarch. 7.	267. μελανήμων	II. 19. 2 (Aesch. Eum. 376)
430. κατὰ κράτος	VI. 29.	319. εὐδοσιόμω	εὐδοσιῶ IV. 71. 1, 58, VII. 59
XIII. 31. ἀποσκήπτω	VI. 55.	XIX.	
129. μέσσω	IV. 16; V. 2. 1; 13. 1. } De Comp. 11 }	184. εὐαναρρεῖζω	I. 59. 4. VII. 15.
152. γνωσιμαχέω	IX. 1.	309. δρασσομαι cf. XIV. 475	IX. 21. 4.
189. φιλοφρονέω (cf. XIX. 36)	X. 54.	XV. 86. XVI. 216.	
358. ἀροστρούμω	VIII. 11.	318. ὑποκατακλίνωμαι	VI. 24. 3, 61. 2.
B. J. Proem. ἐκείνος	II. 64. 5.	(cf. XII. 21)	
II. 169. σημεία	VIII. 88. 1.	XX. 53. ἀσίδιμος	II. 66. 4.
VII. 290. στρώσις	III. 67. 5.		
Vila 116. ἀλεονέκτημα	cf. similar nouns in Dion. ἀδιδουράκη, ἀειπούργημα.		
passim: ἀρόνους	III. 4. 2.		

It is characteristic of Dionysius that he does not force his opinion on his readers, but gives them the evidence on both sides: if puzzled and unable to judge either way, he frankly says so (e.g. I.56: II.32.1: IX.18.) but when both views seem equally plausible he gives his own interpretation, leaving the reader to judge for himself from the data which he has given. There is thus, as Thackeray points out ("Josephus: The Man and the Historian" page 57) a frequently recurring phrase which he uses in such cases e.g. I.48.1 - κρινέτω δ' ὡς ἕκαστος τῶν ἀκουόντων βούλεται. Sometimes it is expanded or modified, but the main outline is the same - e.g. I.48.4 ἔχεν δ' ὅπη τις αὐτὸν ἀείθει. : II.40.30. ἀλλ' οὕτῃ μὲν πάντων κρινέτω τις ὡς βούλεται : II.70.5. εἰ δὲ ὁρθῶς ὑπέληξα ... ὁ βουλομένος συμβαλεῖ : III.35.6. ~~καὶ~~ κρινέτω δ' ἕκαστος ὡς βούλεται. In these contexts he is dealing with apparently supernatural events. The same characteristic is found in Josephus. e.g. I.108. ἀλλ' οὐ μὲν οὖν πάντων, ὡς δὲ ἕκαστος ἢ φίλον, οὕτω σκοπεῖν οὖσαν - the context like that of the examples in Dionysius, deals with miraculous events. (e.g. in I.108 the subject is the long life of the patriarchs.): so too in II.349. ~~καὶ~~ ἀλλ' οὐ μὲν οὖν πάντων ὡς ἕκαστος δοκεῖ διαλαμβάνετω : III.81. καὶ ἀλλ' οὐ μὲν οὖν πάντων ὡς βούλεται φρονέτω ἕκαστος τῶν ἐντολόμενων : III.269. ~~καὶ~~ : III.322: IV.159. ~~καὶ~~ : VIII.262: XIX.108: X.281 (a longer form): XVII.354 ὅπη δ' ἀποσταῖται τὰ παῖδες, γυνῆς ὀνινάμενος τις ἐκαστοῦ κώλυμα οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο τῷ ἐκ' ἀρετῆς αὐτῶ ἀροσσιθεμένῳ : B.J.V.257. This is important evidence that Josephus copied Dionysius' language and style.

Dionysius uses ἑῷος in place of the reflexive pronoun for variety, e.g. II.76.1: III.22.5: IV.4.4. The same characteristic is found in Josephus e.g. Ant.XII.281,285,- who also uses σκεῖος for further variety e.g. XII.423: XIII.84.202: XV.159.218.239.264. 288.330: XVI.27.37.60.138.147.276.277. The construction διὰ [πινὸς] ἔχεν, ἠπιν, εἶναι, γίνεσθαι is very common in both writers, e.g. Dion. Hal. III.22.1. δι' αὐτῆς ἔχεν : VII.62.3. δι' ἀρετῆς. Josephus has all the varieties of the construction, and in addition a



modified form ὡ [πνι] ἔχεν etc. - e.g. XII.60. δι' ἀσφαλείας ἔχεν :  
 XIII.273. ὡ ἐπιδόσει εἶναι : XIV.298. διὰ φρουρᾶς ἔχεν : XV.195. διὰ κατὰ  
 πρῆς : XVI.214. διὰ σπουδῆς εἶναι : XVII.106. δι' οἴκου καταστῆναι :  
 XVIII.72.196.325. διὰ λόγων ἐλθεῖν : XIX.274. δι' ἐγκωμίων ἄγειν :  
 Vita 414. διὰ πρῆς ἄγειν

It is noticeable too that when

there are two forms of a verb's tenses or a noun's conjugation,

Dionysius and Josephus frequently have the same form e.g. Jos. Ant.

VIII.307. ἐφθάσθην Dion.Hal.VI.25.3; ἀγῆοχα Jos.XIV.394. XV.383.

Dion. Hal. X. 6. Sometimes Josephus uses two different forms e.g.

τίδωσι B.J.II.91: III.363: and ἴδωσι Ant.XIV.3. XVI.45. (συντίδωσι

occurs in Dionysius - IV.36. and VI.47.2; though he more regularly

uses ἴδωσι . With the forms βασιλεῖς, βασιλεῖς for example, some

Josephan manuscripts have one form, some another. e.g. βούς

(Jos. Ant. XVII.347.) - cf. Dion.Hal. I.39 (passim.)

Josephus is fond of compound verbs ~~(and words)~~ with two prepositions

affixed, e.g. ὑποκατασκευάζω XV.97.; ἀντιμεταλαμβάνω XVI.66:

ἐπιδακτύλιον XVI.175 (cf. XVII.376); ἀντιμεταχωρεύω XV.163;

ἀντιμεταδίδωμι — <sup>ἀντιμεταδίδωμι XIII.143,</sup> XV.41; and ~~obvious~~ compounds of words

common in classical Greek uncompounded e.g. κρηροφύλακται XVI.84.

~~(In some cases it seems these do not come directly from Dionysius, but~~

~~only indirectly, because similar though not identical constructions~~

~~and combinations are found in Dionysius from whom the mannerism is~~

~~thus probably copied e.g.)~~ <sup>Compare from Dionysius,</sup> ἀντιμετατάσσω Dion.Hal.III.3.25. (cf. De Thuc.

91.): ~~(thus Josephus has ἀντιμετατάσσω (XIII.143.): Dionysius has~~

~~compounds such as)~~ φιλεργεύω (V.66.2.), ἡ δεκαετία I.75.3; ἰδιοβρωτός

I.84.3. : ἀλληλοκτονέω I.65. (ἀλληλοκτονία I.87.3.) κτηνοφορέω II.9.1:

ἀχθοφορέω IV.81.2: θυρομαχεύω V.11.2. *These, like usages, if not like actual words,*  
*may have been copied from Dionysius by Josephus.*

Taken altogether then, the examples show that the influence of  
 Dionysius on the style of Josephus is considerable, and that it  
 amounts to deliberate imitation in some cases. It is curious,  
 however, that Josephus does not so much as mention Dionysius to whom  
 he owes so much in many ways. Judging by present-day standards, we



should expect such dependence to be noted, and at such an omission we should look askance. But it was quite in accordance with the custom of the time of Josephus not to make any such mention. The same is the case with the use of authorities among the ancients: frequently authorities are extensively used (e.g. Josephus and the "Letter of Aristeeas" - Ant. XII. 11 - 118), without any mention. It is not that the feeling of gratitude was not experienced in those days, but only that the modern ideas of reservation of copyright were not formulated, let alone enforced.

#### NOTE.

The 'historical' and 'rhetorical' styles.

There is an important distinction between these two styles: the 'historical' aims primarily at narrating events plainly and simply (cf. the 'narrative' passages in Thucydides) : the 'rhetorical' aims at presenting a more elaborate narrative. The genius of a true historian is needed to produce either style correctly: if care is not taken, the 'historical' style may lead to the fault of an over-emphasis upon the facts as distinct from the way in which they are presented (as with Polybius), and the 'rhetorical' style may lead to a highly coloured narrative, with the presentation of the facts as an entirely secondary consideration.

### Josephus and Polybius.

The references to Polybius in Josephus' works are as follows:-

Ant. XII. 135.f. Josephus quotes the eleventh book of the histories of Polybius - "Scopas the general of Ptolemaeus set out for the Upper regions, and reduced the Jewish nation in the winter": he also quotes Polybius (Ant.XII.136.) for the statement that, after the defeat of Scopas by Antiochus, "Antiochus took over Batanea, and Samarea, and Abila and Gadara, but after a short time those of the Jews also, who dwell around the temple called Jerusalem, came over to him".

Ant. XII. 358. 359. Josephus disagrees with Polybius' statement that the spoiling of the Temple of Artemis was the occasion of the death of Antiochus, but believes rather that it was the spoiling of the Temple at Jerusalem.

Contra Apionem. II. 84.(the Latin version alone is here extant.) Polybius is cited, along with Strabo, Nicolaus of Damascus, Timagenes, Castor and Apollodorus, in support of the view that Antiochus "pecunis indigentem transgressum foedera Judaeorum et spoliasset templum auro argentoque plenum".

It is certain then that Josephus consulted Polybius' history, but it is only used as a secondary source. The main source, though unnamed, for Ant. XII. 240 - XIII. 212 is I.Maccabees, and in XII. 358 f. Polybius is only cited because Josephus is at pains to disagree with his statement.

Again, between Ant. XII. 118, ~~and 120~~, <sup>the Letter of Aristas, ends, and Ant.XII.240, where his next source,</sup> where Josephus' source, I.Maccabees, begins, Polybius is quoted.

(Ant. XII. 135,136.) This further shows the use Josephus made of Polybius as a secondary source, to fill in the gap between his two main sources.

As Strabo is used in a similar way between the end of I.Maccabees (Ant.XIII.212) and Ant.XV., at which point Josephus is well on his way with the particularly detailed narrative of the rise of Herod and his subsequent reign (using Nicolaus of Damascus as his main source) so Polybius seems to be used between the end of "Aristeas" and the beginning of I.Maccabees.

In Contra Apionem II. 84.

Polybius is cited along with others in confirmation of a statement, and



there is no question of his having been used as a primary source in this work, but only as secondary.

Polybius of Megalopolis was born about 208 B.C., and died about 127 B.C. His father was Lycortas, a prominent statesman of the Achaean League. At the age of nineteen Polybius seems to have taken part in a Roman expedition against the "Celts". (189 B.C.) <sup>On</sup> ~~(During)~~ the disruption of the Achaean League, which followed the defeat of Perseus at Pydna in 168 by L. Aemilius Paullus, Polybius was taken as a hostage to Rome. He remained there for seventeen years, when he was allowed to return, with the other hostages. He became a member of the Scipionic Circle while in Rome.

The history which Polybius wrote was in forty books, of which the first five are preserved complete. It dealt with the period from the First Punic War (264 B.C.) to the destruction of Carthage and Corinth, (146 B.C.) and included the fortunes of Asia, Syria, Egypt, Carthage, Macedonia and Greece.

A certain parallel with Josephus is immediately to be recognized. Both historians left their homes for Rome, but whereas Polybius returned to his fatherland, Josephus did not. Both became mediators for their countrymen with the Romans. Both were intimate with the leading men of their day, Polybius with the Scipionic Circle, Josephus with Vespasian, Titus, and Agrippa II. But Josephus was looked upon as a traitor by the Jews, while Polybius on his return was honoured by statues in some Peloponnesian towns. Both wrote histories dealing partly with events through which they themselves had lived. There is a certain similarity of views too. Polybius, no doubt inspired by the Scipionic Circle, saw a certain completeness and unity in the apparently isolated conquests of the Romans, and had a great admiration for the Roman Republic, which he thought was supreme in the realm of politics, but inferior to Greece in the realm of intellect. Josephus too had great admiration of the qualities of the Romans, and of their irresistible strength, and to show this was his purpose in writing the "Jewish War".

*Agrippa II and Titus were bound together by the affection of Titus for Berenice.*



Dependence upon Polybius by Josephus as a secondary source has been shown, and the parallel between the two is so close that dependence for style also is a priori reasonable. Looking at the style of Polybius, it can be seen that the characteristics to be found in Josephus are, for the most part, to be paralleled in Polybius.

I. Compared with Josephus, Polybius seems to make a fuller use of connecting particles, whereas Josephus frequently omits them, or does not use them adequately. Polybius rarely omits them, and has a greater variety, correctly used. In Book III., for example, Polybius entirely omits a connecting particle twenty-two times, eleven of which examples occur in decrees or speeches :  $\tau\lambda$  is used alone four times only, and  $\sigma\upsilon\nu$  alone ten times.

II. Involution. e.g. Polyb. II. 1. 1.  $\tau\eta\varsigma \epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\psi\chi\alpha\rho\epsilon\upsilon\omega \eta\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\tau\omicron \alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ .

III. Perfect and Pluperfect Tenses for Classical Aorist. e.g. ~~( $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ )~~ Polyb. 1, 4, 7,  $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  : II. 12. 4.  $\epsilon\omega\omega\sigma\acute{\iota}\eta\nu\tau\omicron$ .

IV. The Thucydidean  $\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  + abstract noun. e.g. Polyb. II. 2. 1.  $\tau\eta\nu \epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\eta\nu \delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\nu \alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  :  $\sigma\phi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  and  $\sigma\phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$  are used. e.g. Polyb. IV. 9. 2.

V. The forms  $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  for  $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ,  $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$  for  $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\upsilon\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$  :  $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  e.g. Polyb. I. 2. 6 :  $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$  e.g. Polyb. I. 3. 4.

VI. A more abstract mode of expression instead of the highly idiomatic concrete use. e.g. Polyb. IV. 9. 5.  $\chi\omega\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \pi\acute{\omega}\nu \text{'Αρχ}\omega\nu \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega\varsigma$  : IV. 11. 4.  $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \tau\eta\nu \epsilon\omega\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\nu \tau\eta\varsigma \epsilon\pi\iota\mu\acute{o}\tau\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma \pi\acute{\omega}\nu \text{'Αρχ}\omega\nu$

VII. Use of participles:-

(a) In Genitive Absolute constructions, "hanging" at the end of a sentence. e.g. Polyb. I. 78. 11,  $\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega\nu, \dots, \kappa\alpha\omega\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \theta\eta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega\nu\iota\sigma\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu, \epsilon\omega\phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\nu \delta\epsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \text{Ναρθύα} \alpha\rho\alpha\sigma\chi\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma \chi\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ .

(b) With tenses not strictly subordinated to the main verb. e.g. Polyb. IV. 75. 3.  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\upsilon\omega\nu \delta' \dots \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\varsigma \dots \alpha\rho\omicron\kappa\alpha\tau\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon\tau\omicron$ .

VIII. Characteristic compounds. e.g. Polyb. IV. 63. 10.  $\sigma\iota\tau\omicron\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\acute{\omega}$  : 46. 1.  $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\chi\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  : 36. 4.  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  : 32. 7.  $\acute{\alpha}\chi\theta\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  : 82. 3.  $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\epsilon\rho\alpha\chi\mu\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  : 10. 9.  $\phi\upsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  : III. 49. 11.  $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\omega\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  : 70. 4.  $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\tau\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ .

Taking separate words and phrases, we can exclude all technical

military words, because by Josephus' time, these, though coming from Polybius perhaps in the first place, had become stereotyped and common. Other words found in both authors are :- ἰσχυρίζω Ant.XIII. 413. Polyb. VI.8.3. : ἀκέραιος Ant.XII.37. Polyb.I.45.2 etc. : αὐτάνδρος Ant.XIV.275. Polyb.I.23.7. : ὑπολογίζομαι Ant.XIV.50. Polyb.IV.3.12. : ὑδνώτωκος Ant.XIII.35. Polyb.V.34.4. : ἐπιβάθρα Ant.XI.307. Polyb.III.24.14. : ἐπιστροφή Ant.XII.149. Polyb.4.4.4. : ὤκιλος Ant.XII.389. Polyb.IV.38 etc. : κλισία Ant.XII.42. Polyb.IV.18.8 ; X.27.9 : κλισιόφειλος Ant.XII.300. Polyb.V.54.4.etc. : μετονομαζέω Ant.XIII.275 (+ Dat.), Polyb.IX.39.6. : ἁρονοικός Ant.XII.146. Polyb.III.64. : παρῶν Ant.XII.211. Polyb.XVI.11.4. : παρῶν Ant.XIV.460. Polyb.I.34.5. φιλοζώνω Ant.XII.301. Polyb.XI.2.11.

But though the same word occurs in both authors, it is often used with a difference by extension. e.g. ἰσχυρίζω with a participle, as in Ant. XIII. 413 is not in Polybius, who uses the word with accusative, dative, and ἐπί with Dative: similarly μετονομαζέειν τῶς Σαμάρων (Ant.XIII.275) is an extension of the Polybian usage : Josephus has στρατιώτης ἡλικία Ant.XII.366 : Polybius has οἱ στρατιώται VI.19.6 : τὸ ὑδνώτωκον Ant.XIII.35 is hardly the same as in Polybius V.34.4. where Ptolemy Philopator is described as ὑδνώτωκος and ἀνείστως ἐπιβάθρα in Ant.XI.307 is metaphorical, while in Polybius III.24.14 the word is used literally. It may therefore be said that the conscious imitation of Polybian vocabulary is slight. The general stylistic characteristics found in Polybius, though found in Josephus, are not exclusive to the former, and can be paralleled in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Nicolaus of Damascus; so that Josephus' style in all probability rather represents that of the age in which he was writing, the age of the Κοινή Greek.

Polybius then is used as a secondary source, and though there may be a little imitation of Polybius, whom Josephus would certainly have included in his wide reading of Greek literature, it is more than counter-balanced by the imitation of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, with whom Josephus has a closer affinity than with Polybius of Megalopolis.



### Josephus and Strabo.

Disproportion in the "Jewish Antiquities" is partly due to Josephus' sources; where they are full, his narrative <sup>is</sup> ~~tends to be~~ full, and where they are lacking, his narrative becomes incomplete. The period of almost four hundred years from the Return to the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes is contained in two books (Ant. XI., XII.) but the reign of Herod the Great (37 - 4 B.C.), and his rise to fame, are dealt with in over three books (XIV., XV., XVI., part of XVII.) For Ant. XI. and XII., the underlying sources are the Greek Esdras A (Ant.XI.1-c.156), Nehemiah (Ant.XI.159-c.180), Esther (Ant.XI.186-c.296) an account of Alexander the Great (cf. especially Ant.XI.313 - 347), the so-called "Letter of Aristeeas" (Ant.XII.11-118), and I.Maccabees (Ant.XII.240-XIII.212.).

After this point, at which the death of Jonathan is reached, there are no more specifically Jewish works known to us which Josephus could have used as his sources. But, very conveniently, the "Jewish War" is used as a source from the point where I.Maccabees finishes. (Ant. XIII. 212.) In their editions, both Naber and Niese add a footnote at Ant. XIII. {215, comparing B.J.I.50, (I.2.2.) Until Josephus reached the rise of Herod, he seems to have been in difficulty about sources - e.g. in Ant.XIV.190-264, the long list of decrees is not entirely relevant.<sup>2</sup>

One of the intermediate sources thus used between the end of I.Maccabees, and the rise of Herod (at which point he is mainly dependent upon Nicolaus of Damascus) is Strabo. The references to him are as follows:-

Ant. XIII. 285-7. In 285, Cleopatra's quarrel with Ptolemy Lathyrus, and her appointment of Chelcias and Ananias as generals, are mentioned. Strabo is cited to confirm this (286) and his actual words are quoted. (287.)

Ant. XIII. 319. Dealing with the death of Aristobulus, Josephus describes his character, and quotes Strabo "on the authority of Timagenes" in confirmation.

<sup>1</sup> Ant.XIII.212. <sup>2</sup> cf. Karl Albert: 'Strabo als Quelle des Flavins Josephus'. Aschaffenburg. 1902.



Ant. XIII. 347. Strabo and Nicolaus are cited testifying to the fact that Ptolemy bade his soldiers murder Jews and put their bodies into "boiling caldrons".

Ant. XIV. 35. Josephus mentions the gift of Aristobulus to Pompey on his arrival at Damascus, and quotes Strabo's account of it. There is doubt about the length of the citation from Strabo.<sup>3</sup> Naber ends it at Συμμετέχευε (35): Niese at τὰ δὲ ἄλλα (36).

Ant. XIV. 68. Strabo's name is coupled with those of Nicolaus and Livy, to prove that, during Pompey's capture of Jerusalem (63 B.C.), the priests stood fast at the altars.

Ant. XIV. 111. Crassus' action in taking the Temple treasures is the occasion of a slight digression. Strabo is quoted as saying (112) that Mithridates took from Cos, eight hundred talents belonging to the Jews. In 115-118. Strabo is further quoted as saying that the Jews during Sulla's war with Mithridates, formed one quarter of the population of Cyrene; that they have penetrated the whole "inhabited world", including Egypt, where, at Alexandria, they have an "ethnarch", specially appointed.

Ant. XIV. 138. Strabo is brought as an authority to support the statement that Hyrcanus joined in an expedition to Egypt. Strabo, says Josephus, is quoting "Asinius" (Pollio), in one place, and on another occasion "Hypsicrates".

Ant. XV. 9. The actual words of Strabo are given here, showing that Antony put Antigonus to death by beheading him.

All the references to Strabo, then, are confined to three books, Ant. XIII - XV. We may say then that Strabo is a subsidiary source, used to fill in a gap, and supplement the meagre sources which Josephus had between the end of I. Maccabees (Ant. XIII. 212) and Ant. XV., at which point Josephus is well occupied with the very full narrative of the rise of Herod, and his reign.<sup>4</sup>

Strabo's work was suited for use as a subsidiary source. Born at Amasia in Pontus before 50 B.C.,<sup>5</sup> of wealthy parents, and he visited Rome frequently on his extensive travels. He died after

<sup>3</sup> It is important to note that if the quotation ends at Συμμετέχευε, and not at Συμμετέχευε (Schleier), then Josephus has verified a historical statement. <sup>4</sup> and if, with Herod's death, at Ant. xv. 191. <sup>5</sup> Meyer (Paul) 'Quaestiones Strabonaeae', Leipzig 1879, says Strabo's birth was 'ante annum 54 ante Christum n.' : 64-63 B.C. is given in the introduction to the Loeb Strabo.

21 A.D.<sup>6</sup> He wrote a Geography, which has survived, in 17 books. Like Polybius, he admired Rome greatly, and wrote a history in 47 books, of which only fragments survive. This was intended as a supplement to that of Polybius. It recounted events prior to the commencement of Polybius' history in 264 B.C., and later than the end of his history in 146 B.C., and went down as far as the Imperial era.<sup>7</sup> His work was of an encyclopaedic nature, comparable, in this respect, with the Universal History of Nicolaus in 144 books, and would for this reason be a useful standby for historians like Josephus when they had any gaps to fill.

<sup>6</sup> 21 A.D. (according to the Introduction to the Loeb Strabo) is the date of the death of Tiberius, which Strabo mentions. The date is not certain, but it is known that Ptolemaeus was on the throne in 23 A.D. (Cambridge Ancient History, page 644; Tacitus, Annals, IV.5.3 - Juvencus, note ad. loc.)

<sup>7</sup> As he inserts in the 'Geography' a reference to the death of Tiberius (xvii.4), he may have brought his 'History' also up to date.



The use which Josephus makes of Esdras A, Nehemiah, Esther, and I. Maccabees.

It is fortunate that we still possess works which Josephus used as his sources in the composition of the "Jewish Antiquities", for we are thus enabled to study his method of employing them. And a consideration of these sources with this object in view suggests, not that Josephus used each separate source in a different way, but that each separate source <sup>was used</sup> in much the same way.

The book<sup>g</sup> called Esdras A, Nehemiah, Esther and I. Maccabees cover the period which is dealt with in Ant.XI.1 - XIII. 213: Esdras A corresponds to Ant.XI.1 - 158: Nehemiah to Ant.XI.159 - 183: Esther to Ant.XI.186 - 295: I. Maccabees to Ant.XII.240 - XIII.213, respectively.

Esdras A. It is certain that Josephus followed this Greek work, which is another version of the events recounted in Ezra and Nehemiah. There has been some confusion over the title: in the XXXIX Articles it is called the "Third Book of Esdras", Ezra and Nehemiah being known as the first and second books of Esdras. "The First Book of Esdras" (Esdras A) is the LXX title of the work. Considerable doubt exists about the date of its composition. Mr.J.H.How prefers the end of the second century before Christ, or the beginning of the first, and adds that historically the book is not to be relied upon.

Josephus follows Esdras A chapter by chapter, e.g. Ant.XI.1-33 = Esdras A. Chapter 2: Ant.XI.33-42 = Esdras A. 3: Ant.XI.43-66 = Esdras A.4. But, although he thus uses his source closely, it cannot be said that he follows it unthinkingly. There are additions in Josephus which do not appear in Esdras A, e.g. Ant.XI.1. Ant.XI.2.(giving Jeremiah's prophecy in full): Ant.XI.5 (an explanation) Ant.XI.87.88 : 95: 96: 104 (a letter of Darius): 111 - 120: 157 - 158 (giving further details of the life of Esdras, and serving as an epilogue to the story, as the source comes to an end). On the other hand, there are sometimes omissions, e.g. Esdras A.4. 25 - 27 is omitted in Josephus: Esdras A.5. 4 - 41 is omitted, but Josephus justifies the digression he made in Ant.XI.68 : Esdras A.6. 1 - 2 are not in Josephus, neither Esdras 8. 1 - 2, the verses at the

'New Commentary on Holy Scripture'. ed. C. Gore. S.P.C.K. v.s. "Esdras A."



beginning of a chapter often being introductory, and not entirely relevant for Josephus: Josephus also omits Esdras A.1: 6. 5 - 12 : 8. 74 - 78 : 9. 14 - 37 : 9. 46 - 53. If there is a long list of names Josephus uses his discretion, and may omit it. (e.g. Esdras 9. 14 - 37 : 46 - 53.)

At other times Josephus resorts to abridgement of Esdras A by paraphrase as distinct from complete omission. e.g. Ant.XI. 132-134 shortly paraphrases the detailed list of names in Esdras A. 8.28 ff: Ant.XI. 143 - 144 comprises Josephus' version of the long prayer of Esdras in Esdras A.8. 74 - 91.

Numerals and proper names are frequently suspicious in Josephus, and the passage written with Esdras A as the source is no exception to this. e.g. Ant. XI. 54.

Ῥαβιζίκου τοῦ Θωμᾶσιου = Esdras A. 4. 29. Βαρτάκου τοῦ Θωμᾶσιου

Any differences in numerals should rather be attributed to corruption in the tradition of the texts which we possess, than to divergence in the text of Esdras A which Josephus used. But in Ant.XI. 72. the numbers are identical with those in Esdras : 7,337 servants, 245 "singing men and women", 435 camels, 5,525 beasts. The last number is significant, proving that Josephus used Esdras A, and not Ezra and Nehemiah, which both have 6,720. (Ezra 2.64 : Nehemiah 7.69.)

With these qualifications then, Josephus keeps strictly to his source, following it chapter by chapter, and verse by verse, in places.

He brings about a slight change, by the use of synonyms, e.g. Esdras A.

3.15. χηματισμῶν : Ant.XI.37. <sup>ω</sup> <sup>ε</sup> χηματίζεν εἶναι τῶν :

Esdras A.4.5. φονεύσθαι . φονεύειν = Ant.XI.45. κτείνεσθαι . κτείνειν.

Esdras A.6. 32. καὶ ἐν αὐτοῦ (ἰσχύος) κρημασθῆναι = Ant.XI.103. ἀνασταυρωθῆναι.

Long passages of narrative are easily recognizable, however, on comparison with the source. e.g. Ant.XI.90-94 = Esdras A.6. 13 - 22: Ant.XI. 43 - 56 = Esdras A.4. 1 - 41 - the chief difference being that Josephus, in addition to ἰσχύς (Ant.XI.43) also ~~uses~~ uses σύναμς of "wine, the king, woman, and truth"; Esdras has ἰσχύς throughout.

But although he keeps so closely to the original, so closely

indeed that, forgetting ancient literary standards, we are tempted to accuse him of plagiarism, (~~falsely~~), Josephus makes sufficient change to impress upon the narrative his own individuality, expressed particularly in his style. While using the source in such a way that it would be possible to recognize it even if it were unnamed, his finished narrative is certainly Josephan.

It is probable that he even tried to correct obvious mistakes in Esdras A, which, judged from the point of view of chronological exactitude is inadequate, e.g. Esdras A. 2. 16 - 30 relates an event in the reign of Artaxerxes which hindered work until the reign of Darius, who died in 486, twenty years before Artaxerxes ascended the throne (465 B.C.). Josephus (Ant.XI.21-31) puts Cambyses for Artaxerxes which removes the difficulty, though its probability is questioned.

These results confirm those obtained from a study of Josephus' use of the "Letter of Aristeas", and tend to enhance the opinion held of Josephus as a historian, who, although he follows his sources closely, can yet employ them in a critical manner.

Immediately after he came to the end of Esdras A, Josephus took up Nehemiah and used it as the primary source for Ant.XI. 159 - 183. His method of using the source is much the same: he makes omissions, e.g. from the introduction in Nehemiah 1. 1, and 2. 4, 6 - 8, and additions, e.g. Ant.XI.159 ἰβραϊστὴν ..... ἀρχιερωμένων: Ant.XI.161. καὶ τὸ ἀρεῖς ἰθὺν ..... νεκρῶν: Ant.XI.166 ἡρώδου — end of 167, ἑταίρους. Whereas the Greek Nehemiah is narrated in the first person, Josephus used the third person. He paraphrases broadly (e.g. Ant. XI. 174. Neh. 2. 19), and drastically shortens the prayer of Nehemiah, for example, (Ant.XI.162. Neh.1.4-11); and the speech of Nehemiah (Ant.XI.168-173) is very different from that in Neh. 2. 12 - 18. Again, Josephus keeps close to his source, yet imparts sufficient individuality to it to make it at the same time characteristic of himself. He only seems to use Nehemiah consecutively as a

2<sup>nd</sup> New Commentary on Holy Scripture". S.P.C.K. vs. Esdras A.



source for the first two chapters (= Ant.XI.159 - c.174.) : he omits entirely Neh.2.19 - 4.16, and having given a paraphrase of Neh. 4.16 - c.23 in Ant.XI. 177-178, he omits Neh.4.23 - 6.14, picking up Neh.6.15 at Ant.XI.179.

Ant.XI.183 is a brief concluding estimate of Nehemiah, similar to that of Esdras in Ant.XI.157-158. The Greek Nehemiah has thus been used much less than Esdras A, and has therefore been subjected to lengthy excisions and rough paraphrases. But where the source has been unmistakably followed, as in the first two chapters, we can see the same manner of employment as in the case of Esdras A and "Aristeas".

In Esther, we have a longer work, all of which Josephus considered germane to his subject, so that he did not find it necessary to use only a part of the source. The ten chapters in the Greek Book of Esther all have a corresponding narrative in Josephus. Esther I, for example, is the narrative covered by Ant.XI. 186 - 195: Esther 2, by Ant.XI. 195 - 208 : Esther 3, by Ant.XI. 209 - 220. The order of the narrative is followed very closely, and Josephus ceases to use the source at Ant.XI.296, which corresponds with the end of the book of Esther.

After this, comes a passage dealing with the High Priests (Ant.XI. 297 - 312, with the possible exception of §§ 304 - 305.) : Ant.XI. 313 - XII. 10 is a continuous account of Philip, Alexander, and the Successors. Particular emphasis is laid upon the story of the visit of Alexander the Great to Jerusalem during his great Eastern Campaign. The source is not named, but the story is generally discredited by historians as being legendary.<sup>3</sup> From Ant.XII.11-118, the source is the so-called "Letter of Aristeas". When the end of the "Letter of Aristeas" is reached, no further specifically Jewish source can be distinguished until Ant.XII.240, where I. Maccabees begins to be used, until its end, at the thirteenth chapter is reached with Ant.XIII.212.

Esther and I. Maccabees may be grouped together for the purposes

<sup>3</sup>Ant xi. 313-347. W.O.E. Oesterley. 'A History of Israel', Vol. II, page 189, says "Josephus' somewhat 'fantastic' story ..... cannot be regarded as historical".



of a consideration of Josephus' use of them, because his method with both is largely identical.

(a) Josephus makes small omissions where he thinks necessary.

(i) e.g. At Ant.XI.272, Josephus omits Esther 8.10 - 12: the details of names in Esther 9.7-11 are not in Josephus, Ant.XI.289: neither is the ending of Esther, especially 9.23 - 10.3, which is a concluding paragraph not essential to Josephus' narrative. (Ant.XI.295.)

(ii) e.g. I.Macc.2.26. (Ant.XII.270) : I.Macc. 3.25,26,28. (Ant.XII.293) : I.Macc. 4.26-27. (Ant.XII.312) : I.Macc. 6. 6 - 7. (Ant.XII.356) : I.Macc. 12. 37-38 (Ant.XIII.182.)

(b) In a somewhat similar way, instead of making a complete omission, Josephus may paraphrase very shortly what is contained much more fully in his source.

(i) e.g. Ant.XI.198. καὶ —...ἡ εὐδοχίῃ = Esther 2. 5 - 6 : Ant.XI.202 = Esther 2.12-16 : Ant.XI.226 τὰ αὐτὰ γινούσθαι = Esther 4.9 : Ant.XI.242 καὶ ἀπεψάσθαι = Esther 4.5.

(ii) e.g. Ant.XII.269 ὁ Ματθαθαίας —...καὶ ἀμύνειν is a brief report of the speech in I.Macc. 2.19-22 : so too, Ant.XII.279-284 ± I.Macc. 2.49-68 : Ant.XII.290 (speech of Judas) = I.Macc.3. 18 - 22: Ant.XII.300 = I.Macc. 3.42-54 : Ant.XII.414 = I.Macc. 8. 1 - 16.

(c) Josephus expands, makes additions, and gives longer versions or paraphrases, which are not as such in his source.

(i) e.g. Ant.XI.184-185 as an introduction to Esther : Ant.XI.188-189 = Esther 1.8 : Ant.XI.210-216 = Esther 3.7-11 : Ant.XI.247 ὁ δὲ —... τῷ γενομένῳ : Ant.XI.250 κτενοῦσας — 251 δηλοῦν : Ant.XI.255 ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀμύνης — τὸ γέρας : Ant.XI.256-257 : Ant.XI.268 - a section pointing a moral, and rather reminiscent of Philo.

(ii) e.g. Ant.XII.257-264 re Samaritans and Antiochus (not in I.Macc.) : Ant.XII.322 : Ant.XII.344 ἀπικιλή — τῶν ἀπολεμένων : Ant.XII.349 οὐδὲς — ἀνέθενεν : Ant.XII.352. ἕως — ἐσπόμενον : Ant.XII.376 ἄλλο μὲν οὖτως οὐδὲν — ἐβέβαλε (I.Macc. 6.50) : Ant.XII.383-388-Antiochus and Onias (not in I.Macc.) : Ant.XIII.62-73 - on Onias (probably from B.J.VII.426 - 432.) : Ant.XIII. 74 - 79 - on the Samaritans:Ant.XIII. 171 - 173 (a digression on the Sects.)

(d) Occasional use of reported speech instead of the Oration Recta in the source.

(i) e.g. Ant. XI. 271. (Esther 8.8.)

(ii) e.g. Ant. XII. 269 (I. Macc. 2.19-22.) : Ant. XII. 309.

(I. Macc. 4.17-18) : Ant. XII. 350 (I. Macc. 5.57.) : Ant. XII. 364 σὺκ ἀφισπύρες

- end of 365 (I. Macc. 6.22-27) : Ant. XII. 380 (I. Macc. 6.57-59) :

Ant. XIII. 43 σύμμετρον σὺκ ἂν εὐρεῖν (I. Macc. 10.16) : Ant. XIII. 88-90

(I. Macc. 10.70-73 - partly reported in Josephus, then, from § 89, direct.):

Ant. XIII. 204 κτελέων αὐτὸν εἰς Θέραι (I. Macc. 13.15-16.)

(e) Divergences between the text of Josephus, and that of his sources

In Proper Names :-

(i) e.g. Ant. XI. 277 Ἀμόνης .... Ἀμολυκίτης δὲ τὸ γένος :

(Esther 8.13. Μακεδών ).

(ii) e.g. Ant. XII. 266. Σίμων δὲ καλεῖται Μωθῆς , Naber ,

(Niese Θάπης ) = I. Macc. 2.3. Σίμων δὲ καλουμένως Θάπης : Ant. XIII. 11.

Ἀμωμίου (I. Macc. 9.36 Ἰαμβρί.)

In Numerals:-

(i) e.g. Ant. XI. 291. ἑξακισμύριοι καὶ πεντακισχίλιοι ,

(Esther 9.16. μυρίους πεντακισχιλίους ) : Ant. XIII. 131. Μάχον (I. Macc.

11.39 ἑξήκοντα ) .

(ii) e.g. Ant. XII. 313 μυριάδας εἰς a synonym for ἑξήκοντα

χιλιάδας (I. Macc. 4.28) : Ant. XII. 422 χίλιοι (I. Macc. 9.5. τρισχίλιοι ) :

Ant. XIII. 15. ὥς περὶ δισχιλίους (I. Macc. 9.49 εἰς χιλίους ) .

It is impossible to argue from these divergences that Josephus had necessarily a different text of Esther and I. Maccabees from those which we now possess, because proper names and numerals are notoriously open to corruption in the tradition of manuscripts.

Each successive Greek work, then, which Josephus used as a source, and which we now possess and are thus able to compare with Josephus' text, goes to confirm the belief that Josephus used his sources to some extent, in what is today known as a "critical" spirit. He does not blindly copy down the source word for word, although he may follow it

chapter for chapter, and, frequently, verse for verse. He makes ~~(complete)~~ omissions, if he thinks necessary, or only writes down in a few brief words the gist of a much longer passage in his original: he makes additions and explanations to supplement what may be entirely omitted, or too briefly mentioned, in the source: he may change into reported speech the direct speeches of his source, proving that he fully recognized that the purpose of speeches was to give what the speakers may have said in the circumstances, and not what they actually did say.

To infer that the value of Josephus' narrative is equivalent to the value of his sources, is thus to misrepresent Josephus: indeed, his attempts to correct obvious errors in the narrative, especially in Esdras A, confirm the suggestion that Josephus leaves traces of his own individual treatment upon his sources, and enhances their value.



The use made by Josephus of the "Letter of Aristeas".

The "Jewish Antiquities" is divided into two halves, ten books dealing with the period from the Creation to the Exile, and the last ten with the post-exilic history down to the outbreak of the Roman-Jewish War. The second half is characterized by disproportion in the space allotted to events: into books XI and XII, a space of roughly four centuries is compressed, while almost four books (XIV-XVII) are spent on Herod the Great, his rise to power and subsequent reign.<sup>2</sup> This may be accounted for by the sources which Josephus employed, the "Hebrew Scriptures" from which he made a "translation",<sup>3</sup> because, after the events immediately subsequent to the Exile, contained in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which were Josephus' source, there is no important source which he used until the beginning of the Maccabaeen Revolt. Into this gap he brings the account of the translation of the Scriptures by the "Seventy". This is contained in his source, the so-called "Letter of Aristeas to Philocrates", a work actually composed in all probability about 200 B.C.<sup>4</sup> It was written in Greek, and since the work has come down to us, we can compare it with Josephus, and thus consider how he used his sources. As far as the text of the "Letter of Aristeas" is concerned, it is by no means definitely established. Dr. Thackeray<sup>5</sup> has given the manuscripts, which are at least seventeen in number, and divided into two families A (Paris) and B (Paris), of which B is in his view mainly a recension.

The equivalent passage in Josephus is Ant. XII. 11-118. There are certain sections of "Aristeas" which do not appear at all in Josephus. e.g. §§ 1-9, 12-14, 47-50, 66-70, 83-171, 187-200, 201-294, 295-300, 306-307, 322. These passages which he omits are not entirely relevant, or, at least, could easily have been omitted from "Aristeas", e.g. 1 - 9 contain an introduction, 12-14, 306-307, explanatory digressions, 47-50 give the names of the Scribes, 66-70, 83-171, long descriptions, 187-200, 201-294, the discussions during a feast in honour of the Scribes, 295-300, 322, an explanation and recapitulation. It

<sup>1</sup> 536 B.C. - 66 A.D. <sup>2</sup> 37 B.C. - 4 B.C. <sup>3</sup> Jos. Ant. I. 5. <sup>4</sup> cf. Schürer, 'Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ', Div. II, Vol. III, p. 309. <sup>5</sup> appendix, containing the 'Letter of Aristeas', in H.B. Swete, 'Introduction to the O.T. in Greek', pp. 504 ff.

cannot be said therefore that the passages which Josephus omits were not in his text of "Aristeas" which he used: his language often allows us to assume them, e.g. in XII.57, Josephus says he will not give the names of the "Seventy", because he does not think it necessary, "for the names were written in the Letter", and in XII.100 he does not give details of the feast, because they can be ascertained "by reading the book of Aristeas". We infer then that

Josephus used discrimination with his source, and tried not to encumber his narrative, meagre as it is for this period, unnecessarily: out of the whole of the "Letter of Aristeas", the total amount which he used comes to slightly less than a half of the whole.

A feature of his method of discrimination seems to be that when he omits a considerable portion of "Aristeas", he adds something in its stead, very short and to the point, e.g. Ant.XII.17, a section on Aristeas himself which does duty equally well for the introductory sections (1-9) in the "Letter of Aristeas", XII.19 gives an explanation, 42-44 a note about the High Priest Eleazar, 58-59 on the preparations for the reception of the Elders. Such an addition by Josephus nearly always coincides with an omission from "Aristeas", to justify the departure from the source as it were, and explain the alternative he had decided to adopt.

The considerable variations in the text of "Aristeas", judging from the "apparatus criticus", would at first appear capable of settlement by reference to Josephus, who certainly used a text centuries earlier than that of any of the manuscripts which we now possess. There are some differences in the two narratives for which different textual readings seem alone responsible, e.g. Ant.XII.17, and throughout, the form Ἀριστέας, not Ἀριστεύς is best attested by the majority of the Josephus manuscripts, and read by the editors; XII.20, 28 δευτέρῳ ἐκτὸν ἑκοστὶ ("Aristeas", ἑκοστὶ): XII.27.

περὶ ἑκοσίων ("Aristeas" περὶ ἑκοσίων): XII.32. ἑκατημύτων ("Aristeas" and FV (JOS.) τεταρτάων): XII.33. ἐξήκοντα καὶ περὶ ἑκοσίων ("Aristeas" ἐξήκοντα ἐξήκοντα) XII.34.40. ἐκδοῦναι, ἐκδοσέως

6 except P, which has Ἀριστεύς 7 Naber and Niese.



("Aristeas", εἰσοδύνει, εἰσοδισίως ): XII.57. εἰσοδισίως  
 ("Aristeas", εἰσοδισίως δύο ) XII.64. δύο ... καὶ ἡμίσεος ἀρχῶν  
 ("Aristeas", δύο ἀρχῶν ). XII.96. συνεδρίσσε ("Aristeas": Niese:  
 συνεδρίσσει ): XII.95. ὅσῃ σὺ τοῖς ἡμέτεροις συγχρῶνται (Naber), ὅσῃ τοῖς  
 ἡμέτεροις χρῶνται (Niese) ("Aristeas" <εἰ' τοῖς ἡμέτεροις> συγχρῶνται :  
 XII.106. εἰς τὸν ἡμέτερον πόλιν ("Aristeas" εἰς τὸν ἡμέτερον πόλιν).

The divergences chiefly occur in the case of numerals, which are frequently corrupt in all ancient authors, owing to manuscript abbreviations: it is therefore hardly possible to decide in favour of one or the other, without further evidence. So far is Josephus' version from correcting the "Aristeas" texts, that in some cases the "Aristeas" reading, with other manuscript support, is followed in Josephus. e.g. XII. 34. ἐκδύνει Naber, εἰσοδύνει Niese and "Aristeas": XII. 95 also, Niese follows "Aristeas" in part. In cases where "Aristeas" is very corrupt, e.g. 182 ὁ δὲ <ἀρχιερεὺς> Νικάνωρ, Josephus has a paraphrase (XII.94) ὁ δὲ εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἦλθεν ὑποδοχῆς τεταγμένους Νικάνωρ, which is of little value for the actual "Aristeas" text: it is noticeable that the corrupt βασιλεὺς <εἰσαγμένου τοῦ ὑμῶς> - "Aristeas". 176 - has been entirely avoided in Josephus (XII.89.), perhaps even because Josephus himself was not sure of the meaning through corruption in his original.

There are some changes which the very nature of Josephus' narrative compels him to make. Purporting to be a letter, the "Aristeas" is in the first person throughout for Aristeas, who took part in the events is supposed to be narrating what happened, to Philocrates. Josephus changes all into the third person. As a corollary to this, speeches which appear in "direct" narrative in "Aristeas", are changed sometimes to indirect in Josephus, who adds for this purpose εἶπε (or its equivalent) e.g. Ant.XII.32("Aristeas". 92 ("Aristeas".179-180.) 101 ("Aristeas".201.) Even so, Josephus keeps very close to the order of the "Aristeas" narrative: with the exception of the sections, which he omits as not being relevant for himself, or too long for inclusion into his narrative, he follows his



authority section for section. He has not adopted the method of reading the authority, and then putting down in his own words the substance of what he has read, with occasional references to the authority again to verify facts: rather, he has had the "Letter of Aristeas" by his side while composing the corresponding part of the "Antiquities", and followed it mostly section for section, sentence for sentence, and, in some cases, word for word. For example, Ant. XII. 12-41 = "Aristeas". 9-33, consisting of twenty-nine and twenty-four sections respectively : considering the difference in the size of the sections into which "Josephus" and "Aristeas" are divided, the parallel is exceedingly close.

While still keeping very near to the order of sections and sentences in "Aristeas", Josephus uses paraphrases and free renderings, e.g. Ant. XII. 15. οὐδὲν ἔλεγε κωλύειν καὶ τὰυτὰ συμβαλόντα (δύνασθαι γὰρ τῆς εἰς τὰυτὰ χορηγίας ἐπιπροσύντα) for τί τὸ κωλύον σὺν εἰπῶν, ἐστὶ σὲ πῦρ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης; ἀνὰ γὰρ ὑποτίκται σοὶ <sup>ἡρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν.</sup> ( "Aristeas". 11. ) : XII. 77. a broad paraphrase of "Aristeas" 72 : XII. 104-105 of "Aristeas" 301-304 : XII. 115 gives the meaning only of "Aristeas". 318. Some paraphrases are roughly of the same length as the original, but some are decidedly longer, e.g. Ant. XII. 35 ὡς ἀκριβοστάτην εἶναι τὴν πρὸ τέχνης τῆς ὁρῶσι μεγαλοφυΐαν, καὶ διὰ τὴν πᾶν κατεσκευασμένων ἐξουχὴν τοῦ ἑκάστου δημιουργοῦ εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γυνώμενης = "Aristeas". 28, διὰ τὸ μεγαλοφυΐαν καὶ τέχνη διαφέρειν ἑκάστον πύτων : Ant. XII. 41, πῶς φύλακας πᾶν ~~καὶ~~ κυβωπῶν, ὡς αἱ εὐψυχον οἱ λίθοι = "Aristeas". 32. φισκοφύλακες. Some paraphrases, on the other hand, are decidedly shorter, e.g. Ant. XII. 55. φυλαχθῆναι τὴν βασιλείαν ὡς εὐρήνη - a much shorter rendering of "Aristeas". 45. (19a) διασωθῇ σὺ τὴν βασιλείαν εἰ εὐρήνη μετὰ σοῦς ὁ κυριώων πάντων θεός : Ant. XII. 88 occupies four lines in Naber's text, and is the equivalent of "Aristeas" 175, which occupies seven lines in Swete's edition. The use of paraphrase also throws light on the regard in which ipsissima verba were held: Ant. XII. 28 - 31 and "Aristeas". 22-26, quote the king's letter, yet though the meaning and length are the same, yet the actual words differ

considerably, although they both claim to give the text of the letter: similarly with a decree in Ant. XII. 45. ("Aristeas".36.)

Frequently, the changes made by Josephus are almost negligible, yet they are interesting as showing the characteristic turns he thus gives to the narrative. He may add small phrases and words not in "Aristeas" - e.g. Ant. XII.20. εἰς τὸ σπὶ κεχαρισμένον : 23. πολλὴν ὠφελείαν ἐκ τούτου . 23. τῶν ἐπισκευασμένων . 32. εὖ . 35. ἀνθρώπων . 41. τῷ ἱερῷ δοθῆναι . 70. χρυσῷ 75. λευκομερεῖ . 117. καὶ σπονδαῖς : or, he may omit them, e.g. βασιλεῦ ("Aristeas".16) is absent from Ant. XII.21: "Aristeas".21. τῷ θεῷ κατισχύοντος αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σωτηρίαν γενέσθαι ἀλήθειαν ἱκανοῖς from Ant. XII.27 : "Aristeas". 22. ἀρχαῖα from XII.28 : "Aristeas". 25. καὶ ποῖς ἐράγηται πῶς ἐπιτελεσθῆναι from XII.31 : "Aristeas".37. ὅς ἡμῶν τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ δόξῃ κρατῶσθαι ἀφ' ὅλης τὴν σκευεμένην διατηρήσκειν , from Ant. XII.45 : "Aristeas".38. σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις βασιλεῦσι βιβλίους from XII.48 : "Aristeas".75....τοῖς γένεσι ἀραβικῶν ἐχόντων, τετραδακτύλων οὐκ ἔλαττον, ἀνεκλήρου τὸ τῆς κοίτης ἐναργές from Ant. XII. 78 (circa). The examples suggest that Josephus omits more phrases than he inserts of his own : this is consistent with the fact that he only uses about one half of the "Letter of Aristeas".

There are a number of phrases which are hardly rendered freely enough to be called paraphrases, and which yet cannot be said to follow the original exactly : there is a slightly different order of words, and perhaps a slight change of words used in, e.g. Ant. XII.12 σπονδαῖς, εἰ δυνατόν εἴη, πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὴν σκευεμένην συναγαγεῖν βιβλία , = "Aristeas".9. ἀρὸς τὸ συναγαγεῖν, εἰ δυνατόν, πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὴν σκευεμένην βιβλία : Ant. XII. 39. τῶν ἀρχαίων, αἰῶς ταῦτα τῆς οὐδ' ἀπομετρώως συναγαγόμενα = "Aristeas".32. αἰῶς καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ τῆς οὐδ' ἀπομετρώως θώμεν ἐσθίμεν : Ant. XII. 40. Ἄνδρες τὸν ἀρχισυντοφύλακα καὶ Ἀριστῆον : "Aristeas".40. Ἄνδρες τῶν ἀρχισυντοφύλακων καὶ Ἀριστέαν : Ant. XII. 96. τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἐκέλευσεν ἀνὰ χεῖρα κατακλιθῆναι, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς μετὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ κλισίαν , σὺν ἀποκλιῶν τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἀνδρας τῆς = "Aristeas".183.



τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἡμίσεις ἐκέλευσεν ἀνὰ χεῖρα κατακλίνειν, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς μετὰ  
~~(τὸν αὐτοῦ κλισίον, οὐδὲν ἐκκλινόν)~~

τῇ ἐκείνου κλισίῳ, οὐδὲν ἐκκλινόν εἰς τὸ πρῶτον τοὺς ἀνδρας :

Ant. XII. 118. καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς ποσύπους ἡδέως ἔχων καταθέσθαι  
 = "Aristeas". 321. καὶ εἰς ποσύπους τὸν αὐτοῦ καταθέσθαι δαφνίως, καὶ οὐκ εἰς μάταια.

In a great number of cases, Josephus characterizes his version of the source as his own work by the simple use of synonyms. There are synonymous phrases, e.g. Ant. XII. 20. πολλῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ δουλεύόντων = "Aristeas". 15. ἐν σιγκείαις ὑπαρχόντων ἐν τῇ οὗ βασιλείᾳ αὐθῶν ἱκανῶν : XII. 21. τῇ αὐτοῦ μεγαλοφυχίᾳ καὶ χρηστότητι πολλῶν ἀκοιούθως, ἀσώλυσον = "Aristeas". 15. ἀλλὰ τελείᾳ καὶ αὐτοῦ ψυχῇ ἀσώλυσον. XII. 22. τὸν γὰρ ἅπαντα συστησάμενον Θεόν = "Aristeas". 16. τὸν γὰρ ἅπαντα ἐπύκνυν καὶ κτίστην Θεόν : XII. 30. καὶ μηδένα περὶ τύπων κακορχεῖν ἀλλ' ὑπακούειν = "Aristeas". 24. καὶ μηδένα κακοσχόλως περὶ τύπων μηδὲν σίκονορχειν : XII. 31. ἑρὸς τοὺς ἐν αὐτῶν ὑπαρχόντας = "Aristeas". 24. ἑρὸς τοὺς καθισταμένους περὶ τύπων : XII. 36. περὶ τε πῶν ἔη λεγόντων = "Aristeas". 29. περὶ πῶν ἀποκινούντων : XII. 56. εἶσθαι δὲ τῆς οὐκ εὐσεβείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης = "Aristeas". 46. καλῶς οὖν ἀπήσεις, βασιλεὺς δίκαιε, ἀρεστάτος : XII. 91. ἦ' ὑπερβολὴν ἡδονῆς εἰς δάκρυα ἠρούησε = "Aristeas". 178. ἐροῦν δὲ δακρύσαι τῇ χαλᾷ ἀπληρωμένος : XII. 107. τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἅπαντας = "Aristeas". 308. τὸ ἀλήθους πῶν Ἰουδαίων — and also synonymous words, e.g. XII. 13. σπουδῆς ἄξιον ("Aristeas", μεταγρηφῆς ἄξιον) : 22. καλοῦντες (ἀροσυνεζονίτες) : 30. ἀρογεγραμμένον (ἀροκήμενον) : 52. ἡσθίμεν (ἐχέμεν) : 54. ἀπομεινῶς (κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους) : 55. εὐχὰς ἐπιθήσασθαι (γύβασθαι) : 60. ἐκθήσασθαι (ἐξηγησάσθαι) : 60. μαθεῖν (αὐθεῖσθαι) : 61. φθβεῖσθαι (ἐσθάζειν) : 81. ἀμφορέας (μετρητάς) : 110. ἐνερμήσθαι (ἐνερμάσθαι) : 118. ἐπιτρέψαι (μὴ κωλύειν).

All this evidence goes to prove how closely Josephus kept to his original when using the "Letter of Aristeas" as a source. The farthest he ventures away from his source is by use of paraphrases, and even these are not generally very long. He follows the source, giving the same order of events sentence by sentence, as a rule. We cannot say that he uses his source critically, <sup>in the modern sense of the term,</sup> although we are forced



to admit that he can discriminate between what is useful in the source for his present purpose, and what is not. It is doubtful even whether Josephus had another source at this period, for he makes no mention of any other, nor has he any statements contrary to those found in the "Letter of Aristeas". And yet, ~~(in spite of the fact that his use of the source would probably be frowned upon to-day as "slavish")~~ the narrative which Josephus produces is characteristically peculiar to himself: he brings this about to a large extent by changing the order of words in that curious way which may be termed "Involution" (e.g. Ant. XII. 12.  $\sigma\alpha\upsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu \dots \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \tau\acute{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \tau\eta\nu \sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\sigma\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu \sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu \beta\iota\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha$  for "Aristeas".9.  $\omega\lambda\omicron\varsigma \tau\acute{\omicron} \sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \tau\eta\nu \sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\sigma\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu \beta\iota\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha$  ), by paraphrasing at times in his own style. (e.g. Ant. XII.21.  $\tau\eta \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\omicron\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\iota} \kappa\alpha\iota \chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\omicron\tau\eta\iota \omega\tau\omega\nu \acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\tau\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omega\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\omega\sigma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omicron\nu$  , for "Aristeas".15.  $\pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\tau\omicron\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha \psi\upsilon\chi\eta \acute{\alpha}\omega\sigma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omicron\nu$  - thus introducing the characteristic Josephan inexact use of the participle.), and by using synonyms (e.g. Ant. XII.55.  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\iota\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\omicron$  for "Aristeas".45.  $\eta\upsilon\beta\alpha\tau\omicron$  , in characteristic imitation of this Thucydidean mannerism.) ~~(Judged by the modern standpoint, Josephus could be called a "plagiarist"; but he would not stand alone if judged thus. The ancient standpoint in this respect was entirely different from that of to-day, and in this close attachment to his original, Josephus was merely following the custom of his day - a fact which considerably qualifies, if it does not entirely explain away and remove any charge of "plagiarism".)~~

### Nicolaus of Damascus.

Apart from passing references in other authors, which of themselves would suffice for a broad outline, we possess in addition considerable portions of Nicolaus' Autobiography<sup>1</sup>: there is missing a short portion (p.418) near the beginning, and towards the end, (p.422) there are two pages not now extant. According to Nicolaus, his father Antipater and his mother Stratonice were highly esteemed wealthy citizens of Damascus, with two sons, Ptolemaeus and Nicolaus. Antipater gave his promising son Nicolaus a very complete education:<sup>2</sup> before he arrived at manhood, he was far ahead of his school fellows, showing a particular bent for "grammar and poetry". He even composed tragedies and comedies, besides applying himself to "rhetoric, music, mathematics and all philosophy". He was an Aristotelian, but did not use his philosophical learning to gain money. At this point comes the first gap in the "Vita", and the narrative is resumed with an account of his successful pleading on behalf of Ilium, the inhabitants of which had been heavily fined by M. Agrippa for not assisting his wife Julia, who was almost drowned attempting to cross the swollen waters of the Scamander. Nicolaus was evidently there with Herod, who was at that time studying philosophy with him. Later Herod took up rhetoric for a time, until his whim changed to the study of history. It was Herod, says Nicolaus, who begged him to write history, on such a scale that Hercules himself would have failed, if Eury~~stheus~~ had set it him. When Herod visited Rome, Nicolaus accompanied him, and together they studied philosophy.<sup>3</sup> Nor was the manner of life of this versatile teacher inconsistent with the doctrines he taught, in spite of his converse with royalty; his tastes were frugal. The narrative is here interrupted with a considerable lacuna, and resumes with the objections brought against Nicolaus, firstly that he had won undeserved glory from Herod, secondly that he did not save large fortunes with which he was presented, and conversed with his social inferiors. Both of these charges Nicolaus vigorously rebuts

<sup>1</sup> Nic. Dam. Hist. Graec. Frag. Ed. Orelli. Leipzig. 1804, containing an essay by H. Stein.  
<sup>2</sup> Recherches sur Nicolas de Damas. <sup>2</sup> ἐν τῇ ὀλίγῃ ἀριθμῶσι περὶ αὐτοῦ π. 414.

<sup>3</sup> καὶ κοινῇ ἐφίλοσόφουν π. 421.



philosophically, and ends his "Vita" with the statement that he educated his slaves and treated them as friends and equals, much in the manner of Horace.

Thus the autobiography of Nicolaus tells of his accomplishments, and the high position which he gained at the court of Herod<sup>c</sup> the Great, and, even, with Augustus. Constantinus Porphyrogenetus (912-959 A.D.) to whom we owe directly the preservation of such works of Nicolaus as we have, calls him Herod's "secretary", a general term meaning confidant, courtier, teacher and friend. This broad outline is confirmed and expanded in some detail with references in other authors. Sophronius (fl. 7th. Cent. A.D.) says that Nicolaus was the tutor of the children of Antony and Cleopatra, and, according to Strabo<sup>4</sup> he saw the Indian ambassadors who came to Antioch during Augustus' visit to Syria. Josephus mentions his championing of the Jews<sup>5</sup>, although he himself was not a Jew: the embassy on which he was sent by Herod against Archelaus<sup>6</sup> of Cappadocia and his attempt to reconcile Augustus and Herod<sup>7</sup>, by attacking Syllaeus and the Arabians; his part in the accusation of Antipater by Herod<sup>8</sup>; his speech for Archelaus before Augustus in the deliberations resulting in the establishment of tetrarchies after the death of Herod.<sup>9</sup> Athenaeus<sup>10</sup> illustrates his close relationship with Augustus (ἐταίρου οὗτος αὐτοῦ), mentioning that the Emperor honoured Nicolaus who sent him choice dates from Syria by calling them after him. Eustathius (fl.c.1160 A.D., quotes the passage, and Plutarch mentions it, incidentally, in explanation, describing Nicolaus as γλυκὺν ὄντα τῇ ἡθελίᾳ, ἐδιδόνον δὲ τῇ μήκει τοῦ σώματος, διὰ τὸν χρόνον δὲ τὸν ἀποβίωντος ἐπιφρονίσσοντος ἐρεθίσματος. Suidas in his Lexicon, under Nicolaus, quotes the main points from the "Vita".

These notices, altogether, give a reasonably full account of Nicolaus' life, though we have no chronological system given. He was a contemporary of Herod the Great, and survived him, writing of the Emperor Augustus and living therefore up to 14 A.D. at least. If he was tutor to Cleopatra's children, he would probably have been born

<sup>4</sup> xv. i. 73. <sup>5</sup> Ant. xvi. 29-58. <sup>6</sup> Ant. xvi. 332ff. <sup>7</sup> Ant. xvi. 338. <sup>8</sup> Ant. xvii. 99, 110-126.

<sup>9</sup> Ant. xvii. 219, 240-247. <sup>10</sup> xiv. 652. "Symp Prole." 8. 4.



before 60 B.C., his death taking place before 20 A.D. We may also assume that he came into Herod's employ after Actium, i.e. about 30 B.C. Nicolaus himself mentions his detractors, suggesting thereby that even in his life-time his career did not please all, some evidently thinking him merely a flatterer and a time-server first of Cleopatra and Antony, then of Herod and Augustus. Such attacks would doubtless chiefly come from the opponents of Herod. The position which Nicolaus held at Herod's side would inevitably cause dissatisfaction by the very reason of its conspicuousness, and there are still similar charges levelled against him. Orelli<sup>12</sup> calls him "adulatorum vilissimus et gratiae potentiorum studiosissimus auceps", and compares him with Velleius Paterculus. Nicolaus would no doubt have preferred to be compared with his master Aristotle: but, admittedly, it was no mean accomplishment to have attained to such a position of trust, and dislike for Herod should not thereby involve dislike for his friends. Nicolaus was a man of many varied achievements: rhetorician, "musician", philosopher, poet, dramatist, statesman, politician, historian - this is a versatility of which he had some reason to be proud. He is guilty at times of exaggeration (e.g. in describing his history as too big a task for a labour of Hercules) but that is rather due to rhetoric than intentional misrepresentation: it is also in the "Vita" that he mentions his frugality and care for slaves. Nicolaus must have acquiesced in, if not agreed with the policies of Herod and Augustus, and, before that, though perhaps in a less degree of Cleopatra - policies sometimes directly opposed to one another - e.g. Herod and Augustus, against Cleopatra.

His Works. Thanks to Porphyrogenitus we now possess some portions of the works of Nicolaus. His Autobiography has been mentioned above. He also wrote a large history. Athenaeus<sup>13</sup> states that it was in 144 books, while Suidas<sup>14</sup> states "he wrote a general history in 80 books". The fragments which we now possess prove that Suidas is wrong, though, only 80 books may have been known to Suidas himself. There is a considerable portion of Book I surviving, also

<sup>12</sup> Preface, sec. 1. <sup>13</sup> VI. p. 249. <sup>14</sup> v.s. 'Nikólaos'.

of 6 and 7. Josephus mentions Book 4 (Ant.I.159. VII.101.), as do Stephanus Byzantius and Constantinus Porphyrogenitus: Josephus also refers to Book 96 (Ant.I.94.), 123, and 124 (XII.127.) Reference to Books 5 and 9 is also found in Stephanus: to 18 in Porphyrogenetus, to 104. 107. 108. 110. 114. 116 in Athenaeus. This evidence is conclusive against Suidas. The work was a universal history as the references show: the surviving portions of Book I deal with the Kings of Assyria, the labours of Hercules, and the mythical Kings of Lydia and Lycia. Periander of Corinth is dealt with after the sixth book, and the Kings of Lydia, Gyges, Alyattes, Croesus: then comes Cyrus and the Persian Kings, leading up to the legends of early Rome, ending the seventh book. There is a large element of myth recounted in this early history, which is comparable with that which was written by Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus in the same age. The period then with which the 'Universal History' deals is from the earliest times to the establishment of the tetrarchies by Augustus after the death of Herod in B.C. 4. There is no evidence for this final statement: but since books 123 and 124 deal with Nicolaus' petition before M. Agrippa on behalf of the Jews in B.C. 14. (Ant. XII.127) there are still twenty books in which to bring the narrative up to the tetrarchs. This is further supported by the abrupt change in Josephus' narrative towards the end of Ant. XVII., signifying a change in the source, which had been, on all showing, Nicolaus' history. The "Life of Augustus" is preserved almost in its entirety, containing fifteen chapters. It is much in the nature of a court panegyric, but contains much of value in spite of that. Suetonius is supposed to have used it as a source for his "Life of Augustus", according to one theory. <sup>15</sup> Photius says Nicolaus compiled a *ἡγεμονικὴν ἐκείνην ἀναγωγὴν*. It is known to us only at second hand, through Stobaeus. Eustathius mentions a tragedy *Susanna* which Nicolaus published: beyond the name however, we know nothing of it. Stobaeus preserves about fifty lines from a comedy, describing parasites. <sup>16</sup> The titles of some minor philosophical works remain, but no philosophical treatise survives

<sup>15</sup> *ἡγεμονικὴ* Cod. 189. <sup>16</sup> *Σ. 81*:

τὸ πῶν ἀρετῶν ὅσον γένος  
 Διὸς ἀφύκτως ὡς λέγουσι τὸν ἄλκιμον  
 οὐδὲν ἀνέμενος δὲ τῇ τύχῃ χρησθεὶς κατῶς.  
 Ἀπολλοῖον ἔσχε γὰρ ὡσαν ἰστῆ.



which can with certainty be attributed to him. From these notices of his works it may be inferred that Nicolaus was a man of parts, a prolific and versatile writer who found opportunity for composition in the midst of court life.

A parallel with Josephus at once springs to the mind. Both left their native city, and both were historians: in fact, the similarity of parts of the "Vita" of both these authors, suggests a priori inter-dependence: both, we hear, were youths "of precocious talents", and good parentages: both, after a precarious start became confidants of Emperors and client-Kings: both were attacked bitterly for it, and rebutted these charges in the "Autobiography" which each wrote.

There are, however, besides this general parallel, signs of direct use of Nicolaus' works by Josephus as a basis for his own. An author of a general history of the Jews from the Creation would, not without reason, go to the author of a universal history, who was intimately connected moreover with the King who changed the fortunes of Jerusalem so much. This Josephus did, as the numerous references to Nicolaus testify. Some have been given above. And to these, may be added Ant.XIII.250.347. XIV.68.104. XVI.183: Contra Ap.II.84: Ant.I.94.107.159. VII.101. Thus there are references to him throughout the Antiquities, from which it may be inferred that Josephus had Nicolaus' history at hand, to supplement and confirm<sup>17</sup> his own statements and those found in his sources, that is, the Hebrew Scriptures, for the early books. But at the point where Josephus approaches the rise of Herod to Kingship, Nicolaus apparently becomes his main authority. The comparatively long space (three books, Ant.XV-XVII) which Josephus devotes to Herod is highly suggestive of this, besides the references themselves to Nicolaus. When Josephus ceased using I. Maccabees as a source in Ant. XIII., his account becomes distinctly meagre and scanty in comparison until about the middle of Ant. XIV., and after the account of the arrangements after Herod's death (Ant.XVII), the change of source necessitated by

<sup>17</sup> A favourite way of introducing a reference is 'ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦτον ἔγραψεν' (Ant.XIII.250), or a similar form.



the finishing of Nicolaus' history at this point, causes a striking change in the narrative, which degenerates in Ant. XVIII into a disconnected patchwork.

Josephus' use of Nicolaus, especially in Ant. XV - XVII.  
(reign of Herod: 37-4 B.C.)

It may be taken as certain that Josephus did use Nicolaus in these books.<sup>18</sup> Taking the subsidiary sources first, we find that Josephus compiled his narrative with reference to Strabo's Historical Work, written before his extant Geography, and quoted in Ant. XIV. 68. 111. 119. 138. Ant. XV. 9 and 10. In Ant. XV. 174 there is a reference to

the *ὑπομνήματα* of Herod. Schürer<sup>19</sup> believes that the acquaintance of Josephus with these "Commentaries or Memoirs" is at second hand, and cites the Imperfect Tense *ἔρεσκεν* as evidence "that the work did not then lie before the writer." That such stress can be laid on the form of a word, on the assumption of exact use of tenses in Josephus, seems to be disproved by his careless uses of tenses in verbs and participles. In writing these Memoirs, Herod was

following the example of Augustus: we may conjecture that it was at the suggestion of Nicolaus that he undertook it, and since Herod was, according to the "Vita" of Nicolaus, interested in history, he probably welcomed the suggestion of his "tutor" to practise on a subject most congenial to himself. Doubtless, too, Nicolaus helped much in its compilation. Another source is posited

sometimes<sup>20</sup> - a biography of Herod by "Ptolemy". Ammonius "De Adfinium Vocabulorum differentia" quotes the first book of the Life of King Herod, under the heading of the difference between Idumean and Jew, stating that they are not the same. Evidently then the writer of this statement was not a partisan with a bias towards Herod, as Nicolaus was, according to Josephus.<sup>21</sup> This precluded the possibility either that the Ptolemaeus in question was Nicolaus' brother (cf. Ant. XVII. 225 φίλον... Ἡρώδην πρῶτον), or that he was the Ptolemaeus "entrusted with Herod's seal".

(Ant. XVII. 195.) And so the work has been ascribed to Ptolemaeus  
<sup>18</sup> Dr. Hackeney, 'Josephus, the Man and the Historian', p. 66 - "The main source is undoubtedly Nicolaus of Damascus." <sup>19</sup> 'The Jewish People in the time of Jesus (Christ)', Div. I. vol. I, p. 56.  
<sup>20</sup> e.g. in Cambridge Ancient History: vol. x. p. 886. <sup>21</sup> Ant. XIV. 9.

of Ascalon, a grammarian. Schurer points out that the dating of Ptolemaeus of Ascalon in Stephanus of Byzantium is about 210 B.C. He says he was Ἀριστάρχου γράμμας - Aristarchus the grammarian<sup>1</sup>, but that this is generally discredited. It is tempting to conjecture that Josephus saw this work, particularly as the statement in Ant. XIV. 8 and 9 agrees with that attributed to Ptolemaeus by Ammonius, but the confused chronology makes it difficult to speak convincingly of the conjecture. In any case, the rival claims of Idumean and Jew with regard to their original stock, must have been known to Josephus apart from any specific authority.

From Nicolaus of Damascus himself, we may identify passages which could hardly come from anyone else. Since Cleopatra once employed Nicolaus as a tutor to her children, and later cast envious eyes upon Herod's Kingdom, having dreams of the old Ptolemaic Kingdom, we may take it that the accounts of these events come from the man <sup>13</sup> ~~who~~ <sup>who</sup> had been with them both. It is doubtful whether all of this latter passage can be looked upon as history: such statements as § 97, may have an historical background, embellished with details from his own imagination and the gossip of the time. So great is the dependence of Josephus upon Nicolaus supposed to be, that it is even stated that <sup>24</sup> "much of his style here (Ant. XIV-XVII) probably reproduces that of Nicolaus." There are actual references to Nicolaus himself, which though not always agreeing with him, show, at least, that he was consulted :-

Ant. XIV. 8 and 9. Josephus rebuts the statement of Nicolaus that Antipater was a Jew of noble birth (γένος ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων Ἰουδαίων), saying that this was said to please (χαρίζομενος) Herod, Antipater's son.

Ant. XVI. 183-186 (end). A propos of Herod's visit to the tomb of David, when in financial difficulties, Josephus mentions his propitiatory dedication, and says that Nicolaus mentions the dedication, but not the visit, implying intentional misleading of

<sup>22</sup> 'Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ' Div. I. Vol. I. p. 54. <sup>23</sup> e.g. Ant. XIV. 324; XV. 6 ff; B. I. I. 359 ff, Ant. XV. 88-110 (esp) <sup>24</sup> Cambridge Ancient History. vol. I, p. 870. See Appendix I.



readers. Josephus also describes the account of the death of Mariamne and her sons in Nicolaus, justifying Herod, and explains both on the ground of his familiarity with Herod, and that he was writing an encomium on Herod, and "zealously defending his crimes", - an offence only pardonable because the history of Nicolaus was *ὑπερμῆν τῇ βασιλείῃ* (186). Josephus then contrasts his own policy of putting truth before feelings, although he had great respect for many of Herod's descendants (187) - but the passage may possibly have been written after 100 A.D. when Agrippa II was dead.

Ant. XV. 150 ff: XVI. 395 - 404: these passages both contain a criticism of Herod; the first of Herod only, and the second of his sons Alexander and Aristobulus also, whom he executed.

It must be admitted that these passages either contain a direct criticism of Nicolaus, or have such an implication: although for example, Nicolaus is himself not mentioned by name in Ant. XVI. 395 ff., the passage, criticizing as it does Herod's family, must differ from the account which the history of Nicolaus favourable to Herod, would have given. Such passages, then, and indeed the whole account of Herod in Ant. XV - XVII stand in direct contrast with that in B.J.<sup>25</sup> The two versions are by no means of equal length; that of Ant. XV-XVII being considerably longer, and, even of disproportionate length, considering the subject and nature of the work. It is also told chronologically, whereas the B.J. version makes a rough distinction between the public and private life of Herod, and the whole story is worked up almost like a tragedy.<sup>26</sup> As such then it is probably much more close to the original work of Nicolaus, who amongst his other accomplishments, wrote tragedies, and would be quick to notice analogies for possible "tragic" subjects. There is not in the B.J. account any such outspoken criticism of Herod, as in the Ant.

There have been several attempts to explain the origin of these divergent accounts. Hölscher<sup>27</sup> maintains that the main source

<sup>25</sup> B.J. I. 195-670 - a sketch of his whole career. <sup>26</sup> Cf. Dr. Mackenzie, op. cit. p. 65. <sup>27</sup> Pöschke-  
Wissowa, 'Real. Enc.' v. s. 'Josephus'



of Josephus in Ant. XV-XVII was not Nicolaus himself, but a biased Jewish redactor, or a direct "falsifier" of Nicolaus<sup>28</sup>, his views being anti-Herodian and violently pro-Hasmonean. A somewhat similar view, though not so far-reaching, is found in Schurer<sup>29</sup>, who says - "Herod follows Nicolaus as his chief authority, and besides him used only a source that was unfavourable to Herod." In direct opposition to this is the view of Laqueur<sup>30</sup>, that the career of Josephus is one of "Entwicklung", especially in his point of view. He compares Ant. XIV in detail with the B.J. account, and concludes that the Antiquities is correcting the B.J. version. By about 90 A.D., he claims, Josephus had changed his opinion of the Herods, taking now rather the nationalist Jewish point of view, which opposed Rome and the Herods, and approximated rather to the more orthodox view which Josephus a priest, a Pharisee, and a Hasmonean would normally be expected to take. But Laqueur goes on to state that Josephus at the same time made insertions into the B.J., showing his new policy, and that Josephus' source in Ant. XV.ff. has "nothing to do either with his B.J. or with Nicolaus of Damascus".

These then are the two views. Laqueur emphasises an important point in saying that the "evolution" of Josephus has to be reckoned with. With a man like Josephus, who, to judge from events in Galilee, was not of fixed and stable principles, such changes later on in life would be not unexpected, especially if events had removed any obstacles which stood in the way. Such a theory too allows for the human element in the composition of history, which even though it is sometimes to be deplored, cannot be ignored entirely. But Laqueur seems to go too far when he works out this theory with Ant. XIV and B.J., proceeding to show signs of inter-connection, on a partial analogy with the "Rechenschaftsbericht" and the "Vita". His view, however, that the source in Ant. XV - XVII has nothing to do with the B.J. or with Nicolaus is unusual, and seems to disregard the important references to Nicolaus by name in these books.

While evolving his theory, Laqueur makes a quotation from

<sup>28</sup> He calls him 'Nikolaosfälscher'. <sup>29</sup> op.cit. Div. I. vol. I. p. 56. <sup>30</sup> Der. jüd. Hist. K. Jos. -passim.

<sup>31</sup> Juster, showing how common is the view that everything in Josephus comes straight from his sources without criticism: "les Antiquités, dans la partie qui nous intéresse (i.e. the last books) valent en général ce que valent ses sources" : this is, in effect, the view of Hölischer. Such a view assumes that Josephus had no critical powers, or did not use them, in writing his history, his general method being to give a paraphrase of the various sources he had before him. There is, however, considerable evidence that he not only possessed but used critical acumen: he points out where he disagrees with authors, and his reason for so doing (Ant. XIV. 138ff.) : he quotes authors in support of his statements (XIII. 347. XIV. 68. "Strabo, Nicolaus and Livy") : divergences between authorities are stated and weighed (XIV. 119. Strabo and Crassus): the whole tenor of the Vita is to maintain that Josephus sought after "truth" (cf. Vita. 336 - 367) especially, and employed all possible means for obtaining it. Josephus was not then an entirely uncritical historian, as some would have us believe, and it therefore seems improbable that in Ant. XV-XVII also the passages which disagree with Nicolaus should come, not from Josephus, but from a Nikolaosfälscher as Holscher suggests. The characteristically German study of 'Quellenkritik' can be carried too far, if there is a tendency to forget that the historian himself may well have made statements arising from personal convictions.

The more reasonable view then seems to be that Nicolaus was the main source for Ant. XV - XVII, with Strabo, the Commentaries of Herod, and, less probably, the Life of Herod by Ptolemaeus of Askalon. It remains to <sup>be</sup> <sup>~</sup> see how the passages in criticism of Nicolaus came about. Josephus had been connected with Agrippa II ~~from~~ at least from Jotapata to the fall of Jerusalem (70 A.D.), in somewhat the same way as Nicolaus was in close relations with Herod the Great. It would be perhaps expected then that the B.J. and the Ant., being based on Nicolaus would not possess anything derogatory to Herod. But evidently the passages mentioned are exceptions: Ant. XIV. 9, for example, belongs to a time when Josephus did not believe that Herod

<sup>31</sup> Jean Juster 'Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain' p. 12.f.



was truly a Jew, and did not hold the highest opinion of him.

Now the Vita is known to have been written after 100 A.D., and there are two distinct endings in Ant. XX., so that at the same time as the Vita a second edition of the Antiquities may well have been brought out. The date would then be after 100 A.D., when Agrippa was dead, and then Josephus could speak more freely the views to which he had perhaps changed in the last few years: what more probable then that these passages of criticism of Herod and Nicolaus may have been inserted in the second edition of the Antiquities, after the death of Agrippa II ? The inconsistencies to which two different views expressed in the same book would give rise do not appear to have met with the consideration of Josephus, who, similarly, left two distinct endings to Ant. XX. The passages may well have been inserted in a second edition: their position is not such as to make this well-nigh impossible, e.g. the passage in Ant. XVI. 395 - 404 is at the end of the book and could easily have been added later. It is noticeable in this connection that none of the Latin manuscripts of Josephus possess this passage - a fact which may indicate subsequent addition.

If the foregoing explanation of the sources of Ant. XV-XVII is correct, Josephus used Nicolaus in the main, supplemented by other sources, but after 100 A.D., when Agrippa, one of his patrons, was dead, inserted into a second edition of the Antiquities his own sincere personal views of Herod and Nicolaus. Perhaps too the composition of the Contra Apionem, in which Josephus championed Judaism against Hellenism, is indicative of this change of attitude on Josephus' part, which culminates later in the second edition of the Antiquities. Such an explanation involves us in the view that Josephus was guilty of "suppressing the truth" in 94 A.D., owing to the particular circumstances in which he was placed. In Josephus' favour it can be said that it must have been hard for him to do otherwise: a break with Agrippa, which a candid and sincere estimate of Herod's character would have caused, would doubtless have meant



at Rome the loss of his pension and house. It would scarcely have endeared him entirely to the hearts of all Jews, who would be quick to remember Jotapata and Galilee. This must have been a dilemma for Josephus, and he chose the line of least resistance, securing his personal security by keeping in favour of Agrippa II at all costs. It is not to be inferred that Josephus never gave a hint of his personal feelings: Ant. XVII. 27. 28 (especially ἐξετρεύωσαν ) imply a criticism. And this role of "suppressor of the truth" ill befitted Josephus, who was eager to know the truth himself and to write it. This gives additional point to the rather lengthy digressions on "truth" - Ant. XVI. 183 - 186: Vita 339 ff. If both of these passages were written after 100 A.D. (death of Agrippa) - and there is indisputable evidence for the last, and probability for the first - they are, as it were, a defence of the changes in his attitude. Josephus, who suppressed his true feelings originally, feels conscience smitten about it, and with the death of Agrippa and the antagonistic history of Justus as incentives, Josephus, feeling that Justus' attack was partly justified, wrote τὰ μέχρι νῦν σεσωσμένα (Vita 338), and takes care, in self-defence, to point out the reason for his action - the absolute claims of truth upon a historian.

The sources of Josephus, Ant. XVIII - XX.

There is adequate evidence to support the statement that one of the chief sources on which Josephus' "Jewish Antiquities", XIV. ff., was based is the works of Nicolaus of Damascus, friend and counsellor of Herod the Great. Some disconnected fragments are now the sole surviving relics of his works, which included an "Universal History" in 144 books. From about the middle of Ant. XIII. onwards, Josephus is dealing with the same period and subject as that about which Nicolaus had written. There are also actual references to him: sometimes he is quoted as confirming Josephus' statements, together with other writers (frequently Strabo), and what purport to be his actual words are quoted: at other times his statements are criticized (especially Ant. XVI. 183 - 186 where his historical method is examined).

Towards the end of Ant. XVII., however, Josephus' narrative arrives at the death of Herod the Great<sup>2</sup>, but from further references to Nicolaus himself<sup>3</sup>, it may be inferred that in all probability Nicolaus carried his history down at least to the establishment of the tetrarchies by Augustus after Herod's death - a period with which the end of Ant. XVII. roughly coincides.

By the beginning of Ant. XVIII., then, at the latest, Josephus must have turned to fresh sources. Henceforth, we have not the same tolerably certain evidence pointing to a single main source; it is difficult to enumerate any with certainty. Reading Ant. XVIII., immediately after Ant. XVII., no one can fail to be struck by the change in the type of narrative, and Ant. XVIII is a rather uncoordinated patchwork - a fact which is all the more significant since we know that there must have been a change of source about that time. The contents of Ant. XVIII., when tabulated, illustrate very clearly the lack of co-ordination :-

- Ant. XVIII. 1 - 10. Dispatch of Quirinius to Syria: Coponius to Judaea as procurator.
- 11 - 26. Account of the Jewish Sects.
- 26 - 36. Procurators.
- 36 - 38. Mention of Herod the Tetrarch.

<sup>1</sup> C. p. XIII. 250, 247 : XIV. 9, 68, 104, 183 ff.    <sup>2</sup> Ant. XVII. 191.    <sup>3</sup> C. p. Qu. XVII. 240-249, 315-317.

- 39 - 54. Events in Parthia.
- 55 -105. Procurators: Pontius Pilate, under whom occurred four "tumults",<sup>4</sup> and Vitellius.
- 106 -108. Mention of Philip, Herod's brother; introduced by
- 109 -115. Mention of Herod the tetrarch, and his war with Aretas.
- 116 -119. John the Baptist.
- 120 -126. Intervention of Vitellius, governor of Syria, in the war with Aretas.
- 127 -129. Further introduction of "Herod and his family", and Agrippa. (129).
- 130 -142. Family of Herod.
- 143 -239. Career of Agrippa in Rome; - the details of Tiberius' treatment of the provinces.  
170 - 178 is not strictly relevant; neither is the account of the death of Tiberius, 205 - 227, and the appointment of a successor. (The statement in 224, Τιβέριος — ὑψιστοῦς is questioned by historians.)
- 240 -256. Banishment of Herod the Tetrarch.
- 257 -309. Gaius' attempt to set up a statue of himself in the Temple: Petronius' delay.
- 310 -379. Account of the Jews in Babylon.

The contents of Ant. XIX., when tabulated, show a similar general method of compilation:-

- Ant.XIX. 1 -235. An account of the murder of Gaius and the accession of Claudius.
- 236 -244. Mention of Agrippa: a fateful speech to the Senate.
- 245 -273. Claudius' preliminary measures.
- 274 -277. Agrippa's Kingdom is confirmed and enlarged by Claudius in gratitude.
- 278 -286. Anti-semitism in Alexandria. Decree of Claudius.
- 287 -291. A similar decree of toleration throughout the Roman world.
- 292 -298. Further career of Agrippa.
- 299 -311. Another decree by Petronius, legatus of Syria.
- 312 -316. Agrippa's appointments to the High-Priesthood.
- 317 -353. Agrippa's career up to his death: estimate of him.
- 354 -366. Reversion to Procurators by Claudius, Agrippa II. being yet a minor.

<sup>4</sup> the same word (ἀγούρι or ἀγούριον) is used in each case.



The contents of Ant. XX., when tabulated, appear thus :-

- Ant.XX. 1 - 9. Procurators. Longinus and Fadus.
- 10 -14. A decree of Claudius.
- 15 -16. Petition by "Herod, brother of the late Agrippa".
- 17 -53. An account of Helena, Queen of Adiabene, and her Judaizing son, Izates.
- 54 -96. Izates and Parthia.
- 97 -117. Procurators. Fadus. Tiberius Alexander. Cumanus.
- 118 -136. Under Cumanus, quarrel of Jews and Samaritans. Claudius' intervention: banishment of Cumanus.
- 137 -147. Felix procurator. Agrippa II. and his sisters' marriages.
- 148 -157. Death of Claudius, accession of Nero; short account of him, and reflections on the writing of history.
- 158 -159. Nero and Agrippa.
- 160 -178. Procurators. Felix.
- 178 -181. Agrippa and the High Priests.
- 189 -196. Agrippa's buildings; Festus' objection.
- 197 -210. Procurators. Albinus.
- 211 -214. Agrippa's building policy.
215. Procurators. Gessius Florus.
- 216 -218. Agrippa grants the request of the Levites.
- 219 -223. Agrippa and the completion of the Temple-building.
- 224 -251. A list of the High Priests, from the time of Aaron to 70 A.D.
- 252 -258. Procurators. Gessius Florus : Outbreak of the war.

Such a tabulation of contents, tends, by its very nature, to make events appear more disjointed than they are in actual fact. But a consideration of them should lead, at the least, to evidence on the method of composition, at the most, to an indication of the type of source on which they must be based. At the outset, Ant. XX. stands out in contrast to Ant. XVIII., as being comparatively well constructed and co-ordinated. The following sections are digressions :- 17 - 96 dealing with the history of Parthia and

Adiabene, with special reference to the Judaizing king Izates, and of which the object seems to be to emphasize the advantages of Judaism and the especial "providence" <sup>5</sup> which God exercises over its devotees: 148 - 157 the account of the death of Claudius and the accession of Nero, and an estimate of him as Emperor. (§ 154 points out in effect that this is a digression.) : 224 - 251. A list of the High Priests from Aaron to the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D. This also he admits is a digression, but "necessary and befitting this history" (224), the more so since Josephus himself was of priestly line.

But in spite of these digressions, which after all are not entirely irrelevant and are explained, Ant. XX. is not a mere patchwork, and the general outline of the contents is an account of the procurators, methodically alternating with the career of Agrippa.

Ant. XVIII. appears in vivid contrast: running through the whole is the account of the procurators: this list is interspersed with digressions, e.g. 11 - 26, which give the impression of having been inserted merely to swell a narrative for which the author had not many sources to hand. In 129, Agrippa is introduced, in terms of commendation (Θαύματος ἀξιωματόν): the details of his stay in Rome are very full, and a lengthy version of Gaius' decision to set up his statue in the Temple at Jerusalem is followed by a narrative of events in Babylon.

Sections 1 - 273 of Ant. XIX. (with the exception of 236 - 244. Agrippa's speech to the Senate) form an account of the conspiracy resulting in the murder of Gaius, and the accession of his uncle Claudius. In a history of the Jews, such disproportionate space allotted to an event not connected with the Jews as such, is irrelevant. A mention of the murder may have been expected, especially since the advent of Claudius brought a reversion to Augustus' policy of a client-Kingdom in Judaea, but an account spreading over more than half a book (roughly 270 sections out of 366) is not necessary here. After this, the career of Agrippa is narrated, until his death (353) followed by the change again to government by procurators.

§ 29. καὶ θεοῦ ἀρμόσιον.



Looking at the contents then and noticing the patchwork nature of Ant. XVIII., and the disproportionate length attributed to particular events in XIX., which otherwise, like XX. is comparatively well connected and composed, what may be inferred about the sources? First and foremost it should be emphasized that we have no actual references by name to sources in Ant. XVIII. - XX. by Josephus, so that in the absence of such evidence and of the ancient authors who are supposed to have written on the same period, any conclusions must inevitably be largely conjectural.

It has been noted that the career of Agrippa I. in Rome and elsewhere is treated fully. This is prefixed by an account of the family of Herod the Great (XVIII.130ff.). The care with which this list is introduced (127 - 129), and the fact that the remainder of XVIII. is, henceforward, mostly taken up with Agrippa, or members of Herod's house, may be taken to suggest that Josephus' account is here based on a source which dealt with the family of Herod the Great. The probability is strengthened by the accounts of the descendants in XIX. and XX. They receive full mention - as indeed could be expected from a history entitled "Jewish Antiquities". We do not now possess any such source, so that we are unable to confirm our hypothesis. It is known, however, that there was a biography of Herod<sup>6</sup> which Josephus used, and it may be that Agrippa copied Herod's example, and wrote "memoirs". There is also the possibility that Josephus may have heard the full details of Agrippa I. from his son, later Agrippa II., with whom Josephus was in the closest of relations.<sup>7</sup> Born in 37 A.D., Josephus was himself a contemporary of the period with which XVIII. 224 - XX.(end) deals; and even if he did not know the events of his infant years, he would have had ample opportunity of ascertaining them. Personal experience must not be discounted~~ended~~ in enumerating the sources of Ant. XVIII. - XX. : this, added to the fact that he was a close friend of Agrippa II., who may, like Herod the Great, have written either his own memoirs, or his father's, or both, thus gives a conjectural explanation of the probable source of

<sup>6</sup> ἱστορίαια - Ant. xv. 174. <sup>7</sup> cf. B.S., and Vita.



Josephus' knowledge of the House of Herod.

Interspersed with the account of the Agrippas in XVIII. - XX., there is also a list of the procurators: this is to be seen most strikingly in the contents of Ant. XX. From A.D.6., it is only to be expected that the procurators of Judaea should figure in any history of the Jews: in this, Josephus does not come below our expectations. There are various hints that an account of the procurators may have been one of the chief sources for his account of the period. From these books, the impression is that such a list is the basis, being filled out with other apparently relevant narrative, however crudely, e.g. Ant. XVIII. 1 - 10. Procurators: 26 - 36 Procurators: 55 - 105 Procurators. In 36 - 38 a mention of Herod the Tetrarch is inserted, without any other connection with the subject-matter than general chronological sequence: so too 106. τό τε δὲ καὶ Φίλωνος : 109. ἐν πύλῃ δέ . After XIX. 1 - 273, also, we find decrees of Claudius - XIX. 286, 287 - 291, 299 - 311 (decree of Petronius with Claudius' sanction.). Then Ant. XX. finishes with the accounts of the procurators and Agrippa evenly alternating. In the early part of Ant. XVIII., it seems then, it was an account of the procurators around which other notices were inserted until the time for the entry of Agrippa. (XVIII. 127.). This account would extend over the period covered by Ant. XVIII. - XX. But, as with the account of the Agrippas, so here the proviso must be made that especially towards the latter end of the period of Ant. XVIII. - XX., Josephus was an eye-witness of events in Judaea, and could thus well rely on his own experience as a source. Seeing, however, that he laid some emphasis on "truth",<sup>8</sup> he probably verified his own recollections by consulting authorities. Josephus had lived in Rome since soon after 70 A.D., and had access to all the records stored in the Capitol:<sup>9</sup> this evidence strengthens a conjecture that he may have seen an official account of the Jewish procurators to confirm his own recollections. Such sections of Ant. XVIII. - XX. as may belong to such a list, suggest that it is rather from the Roman point of view that

<sup>8</sup> e.g. Ant. xx. 154, 260 ff. <sup>9</sup> see Note I - 'Did Josephus know Latin?'

they are written, e.g. Κωνῆσιος τὸ αὐτὸ (Κυβινίω) συγκαταλέγειται  
 (the same event, looked at from the Jewish point of view, would  
 probably have been stated thus: - Κωνῆσιος τ' αὐτὸ συναβικνήθη κατ' ἡμᾶς :  
 so too XVIII. 55. Πικάνης δ' ὁ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἡγεμὼν : ἐνὶ Κηλύσει πῶν νομάρχων  
 πῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν. This list then which Josephus may have used, was  
 probably in Latin, and it would not be unusual for Josephus to refer  
 to a list in Latin, since there was probably nothing in Greek or  
 Aramaic so easily accessible as the Capitol records.

The disproportionate space given to events in roughly the first  
 half of Ant. XIX. cannot fail to be noticed, and attempts have been  
 made to determine its source. The nature of the subject, and its  
 disproportionate length, have caused scholars to think that this too  
 probably emanated from a Latin original. Josephus' own justification  
 of the digression appears in Ant. XIX. 15, where he says that the Jews  
 would have come near to perishing at the hands of Gaius, if it had not  
 been for his sudden death (cf. XIX. 1.) : in XIX. 16, also, he says  
 it is another proof of the "power of God" - Josephus' constant theme  
 that God helps the pious and punishes the impious. Mommsen first  
 formulated the view that Josephus was here using for his source the  
 history of a certain Cluvius Rufus. There is a slight discrepancy  
 about the actual sections which Mommsen ascribed to him; "-----Mommsen's  
 hypothesis (is) that Ant. XIX. 1 - 270 is based on Cluvius Rufus" - is  
 one statement,<sup>11</sup> while another is "it is highly probable that Mommsen  
 was right in thinking (Cluvius Rufus) the source of ----- Ant. XIX. 17 -  
 200: 212 - 273".<sup>12</sup> This alone illustrates the difficulty of assigning,  
 with any degree of unanimity, definite sections to one source, and  
 implying that exactly at that point the author laid aside one source,  
 and picked up another.

#### The Evidence for the Theory.

Cluvius Rufus is chiefly known through the following references,  
 found in Tacitus for the most part:-

1. Fabius Rusticus auctor est scriptos esse ad Caecinam Tuscam  
 codicillos, mandata ei praetoriarum cohortium cura, sed ope Senecae
- <sup>11</sup> Ant. XVIII. 2. "Camb. Anc. Hist. vol. 5. p. 867. <sup>12</sup> J. P. V. D. Balsdon 'The Emperor Gaius'  
 pp. 223-224.



dignationem Burro retentam. Plinius et Cluvius nihil dubitatum de fide praefecti referunt. (Tac. Ann. XIII. 20. 3. Furneaux. date 55 A.D.)

2. Tradit Cluvius ardore retinendae Agrippinam potentiae eo usque provectam, ut medio diei, cum<sup>id</sup> temporis Nero ----- (Tac. Ann. XIV. 2. 1. Furneaux. A.D. 59.)

3. Caeso Galba in Othonem pronus nec Africa contentus Hispaniae angusto freto dirēptae fremebat. Inde Cluvio Rufo metus; et decimam legionem propinquare litori ut transmissurus iussit. (Tac. Hist. II. 58. date, 69 A.D.)

4. Digressum a Lugduno Vitellium Cluvius Rufus adsequitur omissa<sup>a</sup> Hispania, laetitiam et gratulationem voltu ferens, animo anxius et petatum se criminationibus gnarus. (Attack of Hilarius.) Auctoritas Cluvii p<sup>a</sup>revaluit, ut puniri ultro libertum suum Vitellius iuberet. Cluvius comitatu<sup>i</sup> principis adiectus, non adempta Hispania, quam rexit absens exemplo L. Arrunti. Eum Ti. Caesar ob metum, Vitellius Cluvium nulla formidine retinebat. (Tac. Hist. II. 65. date, 69 A.D.)

5. Verba vocesque duos testes habebant, Cluvium Rufum et Silium Italicum. Voltus procul visentibus notabantur, Vitellii proiectus et degener, Sabinus non insultans et miseranti proprior. (Tac. Hist. III. 65. date, 69 A.D.)

6. Hispaniae praeerat Cluvius Rufus, vir facundus et pacis artibus, bellis inexpertus. (Tac. Hist. I. 8.)

7. Igitur Mucianus ....., citeriorem Hispaniam ostentans discessu Cluvii Rufi vacuam ..... (Tac. Hist. IV. 39. date, 70 A.D.)

8. Igitur a laude Cluvii Rufi (Montanus) orsus, qui perinde dives et eloquentia clarus nulli umquam sub Nerone periculum facessisset, crimine simul exemploque Eprium urgebat. (Tac. Hist. IV. 43.)

9. Κλούβιος δὲ τούτος εἰς Ἰβηρίαν φησὶ κομισθῆναι διασωπῆτα ὅς ἐκατέρωθεν τοὺς γερμανηφόρους, τὸ τοῦ Νέρωνος θετὸν ὄνομα ἀπογεγενημένον ἔχοντα πρὸς τὸ Ὀθωνος. (Plutarch. Otho. 3.)

10. Cluvius Rufus is cited in a discussion on the word "histrion". (Plut. Quaest. Rom. 107.)

11. ... utque constitit, peracto principio, Niobam se cantaturum per



Cluvium Rufum consularem pronuntiavit, et in horam fere decimam perseveravit. (Suet. Nero. 21. 2. re Nero's visit to Greece, accompanied by Cluvius Rufus, cf. Dio Cass. 64. 14. 3.)

12. Cluvius is called a "historicus". It can also be inferred that his history dealt with Verginius Rufus (conspiracy against Nero. 68 A.D) Pliny Ep. IX. 19. 5.

13. Cluvius, a ἱστορικὸς, when asked by Vatinius, ἀλλὰ ἐρεπτηγικῶς, whether he had heard anything of the conspiracy against Gaius, answered :- Σίγη μὲν τις ἄλλος Ἀγαθῶν μῦθον ἀκούει (Jos. Ant. XIX. 91. 92. date, 41 A.D.)

### His Life and Career.

In these references he is thus quoted as an authority in 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, while 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, deal rather with his career. We may infer with regard to his life that he survived at least the year of the Four Emperors - A.D. 69. (3,4,5,7,9.) : in 41 A.D., he was a ἱστορικὸς (13 cf.11.) From this it may be supposed that he was born at least by 8 A.D., possibly earlier: but since, by Gaius' time, the "cursus honorum" was often the object of arbitrary change according to the Emperor's caprice, it is impossible to arrive definitely at the lowest computation of the age of Cluvius in 41 A.D. The date of his death is not known, except that it was after 69 A.D.: during Nero's lifetime he seems to have occupied an important position; he accompanied Nero on his notorious visit to Greece. (11.) His "province" in the year of the Four Emperors, 69 A.D., was Hither Spain (6,7,) which he seems to have governed, for a period, from Rome, following Pompey's precedent. (4.) In the upheaval in the provinces which events in 69 caused, Cluvius joined Vitellius at Lyons (4) before whom he was unsuccessfully accused (presumably of treachery.). Vitellius, however, kept him on his staff, for the short period of his Principate. Of his subsequent fate we know nothing. His character is partially drawn in the references to him: he was an eloquent man, possessing the accomplishments of civil life, but

lacking experience in war (6) - hence perhaps his accusation before Vitellius. (4) As far as it is possible to judge his attitude to the Principate, and to Gaius in particular, from Josephus (13), he was not so violently opposed to Gaius as to conspire personally against him, or such a staunch supporter of Gaius as to denounce the man who uttered the word "revolution": no doubt he had his personal views, but was wise enough to hide them. His interest in antiquarian matters (10) was shared with other historians, like Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

His history. That Cluvius wrote a history is shown by the references to it. Pliny actually calls him "historicus" (12). We know that it dealt at least with events in 55, <sup>A.D.</sup> (1); 59, (2); 68, (12); 69, (9); - that is, at least with the reign of Nero and the year of the Four Emperors. . It was thus probably written in the early years of Vespasian's Principate, when Cluvius had settled down after the events of 69 in which he took part with Vitellius. Its title is not known, neither has it come down to us, even in fragmentary form. Following the established custom with ancient historians, Cluvius probably started his history at the point where some other historian had left off. We know that Livy's history went up to the reign of Augustus, so that Cluvius' history may have been for the most part a history of the years in which he himself had lived, and covered the period from the death of Augustus to the death of Vitellius. (i.e. 14 A.D.-70 A.D.) This, however, is only conjecture, unsupported by concrete evidence.

Cluvius as a source for Ant. XIX. Mommsen and Schiller claimed Cluvius as the primary source <sup>13</sup> for Suetonius, Lives of Claudius, and Nero, and for the corresponding parts in Dio Cassius, and that Tacitus used him in Hist. I., and Plutarch in his life of Galba. Except for Suetonius, "Claudius", we know that Cluvius' history dealt with the period which those works cover, but to say, with Mommsen <sup>14</sup> that Cluvius was the source in Josephus! Ant. XIX. 1 - 273, seems to involve more.

The mainstay of the hypothesis is Ant. XIX. 91,92, where Cluvius is mentioned, and the details about him appear to be such that they

<sup>13</sup> Pauly-Wissowa Real-Enc. v.s 'Cluvius Rufus'. <sup>14</sup> and, recently, Mr. H.P. Charlesworth, Cambridge Historical Journal vol IV, no. 2, 1933 - 'The tradition about Caligula'.



probably came from Cluvius Rufus himself in his history. In so far as the whole passage seems to have come from a Roman hand, such an explanation (~~partly~~) might <sup>partly</sup> explain the source. Yet any support of the theory must involve three important assumptions; firstly, that Cluvius narrated the reign of Gaius (which can only be conjectured from e.g. the extent of Livy's History and possible references which may have been contained in the lost books of Tacitus' Annals, secondly, that Cluvius Rufus is the main, if not the only source for the passage, thirdly, that Josephus knew enough Latin to translate Cluvius. (It is certainly improbable that Josephus knew no Latin at all,<sup>15</sup> but the theory adds this to Josephus' accomplishments by tacit assumption, without adequate consideration of its implications.)

There is one excerpt from the passage, of which it can be said with greater certainty that it can hardly have come from Cluvius Rufus. In Ant. XIX. 236 - 245, there is an account of the momentous advice of Agrippa to the Senate. Elsewhere, in other authorities which we possess, Agrippa does not play such an important role: and even if Cluvius were the source on which the early part of Ant. XIX. is based, this excerpt could hardly have come from the pen of a Roman "consular" himself, who even if it were true, would not desire to perpetuate the story. Rather do §§ 236 - 245 look like a story told by supporters of the Herodians: and since Josephus himself was on good terms with the son of the Agrippa there mentioned, it is as likely that he may have heard the story from that source as that he took it from Cluvius Rufus. To say that Cluvius was the source which Josephus used in Ant. XIX. 1 - 273, then, seems, apart from this passage on Agrippa, which can hardly have come from him, to go beyond the evidence, and to make assumptions which it is difficult to prove with our present evidence. On the other hand, it is impossible to say that Cluvius Rufus was not the source: he may have been, but the statement is, after all, merely conjecture, and not a fact definitely established by a shred of actual evidence. It is noticeable that if Ant. XVIII. 310 - 379 is omitted (and it is largely in the nature of a

<sup>15</sup> see Note I, 'Did Josephus know Latin?'



parenthesis) Ant. XVIII. 310. and Ant. XIX. 1. appear to follow on naturally, i.e. καὶ Περωνίῳ ... διεφύχθη ἐξήως ὁ κίνδυνος τοῦ θανεῖν, ἥμος δ' οὐκ εἰς μόνους Ἰουδαίους. Here again there is no actual evidence that the source was the same, but the nature of the subject-matter could be taken to suggest it (first Gaius' misdeeds in Jerusalem (XVIII), then in Rome (XIX), and the importance assigned to Agrippa in each case (Ant. XVIII. 289 - 300; Ant. XIX. 236 - 245) is equally suggestive of a parallel. Even where we know a source was used, and possess that source, it is difficult always to assign the exact sections which are based on it, and in the present case, where the source is non-existent now and therefore largely a matter of conjecture, we cannot with safety make categorical statements for or against. The words of Dr. Wight Duff<sup>16</sup>, a propos of Livy, can be applied to sum up the situation in this case. "But there must be wide uncertainty about a literary pedigree where so many of the originals have perished, and where the author so frequently omits all acknowledgement of borrowing....."

The contents of Ant. XVIII - XX., when tabulated, were found to contain a number of digressions, which presumably were based on some source. As they do not always follow strictly the general trend of the narrative, it may be doubted whether their source is the same. First there are the accounts of Tiberius and Nero. Josephus, in Ant. XVIII. 170 - 178 gives the point of view of Tiberius with regard to the duration of governors' term of office in their provinces (a policy on which he was an innovator): this is followed in Ant. XVIII. 205 - 227 with an account of the succession, showing how Tiberius yielded to necessity, and grudgingly appointed Gaius, instead of the rightful heir Tiberius Gemellus. (224) (The correctness in detail is now questioned~~now~~ by historians.) Similarly Ant. XX. 148 - 157 shortly narrates the death of Claudius and the accession of Nero, and estimates the value of his principate. Neither are actually relevant in the context, and suggest perhaps a Roman source. It may even

<sup>16</sup> 'A Literary History of Rome'. p. 643.

be the same source as that in Ant. XIX., but there is no conclusive evidence for or against. The account of the Jewish sects in Ant. XVIII. 11-26 was probably written by Josephus without reference to any written source, considering that he himself had studied the sects,<sup>17</sup> and could therefore speak from personal experience. The list of the High Priests<sup>18</sup> would be based partly on his own memory, belonging as he did to the Priestly class, partly perhaps on some Jewish document containing them. Such a record would not be difficult for a man in Josephus' circumstances to find. Two main accounts of events in Parthia are found, namely Ant. XVIII. 39-54, XX. 17-96. No mention of any source is made, and conjecture even is difficult, and hardly possible, except that the source was probably Jewish: the same holds good of the account of the Babylonian Jews in Ant. XVIII. 310 - 379.

An enquiry into the sources of Ant. XVIII-XX., then, does not produce much which can be looked upon as definite and indisputable. In the first part of Ant. XIX., even where at first sight there appears to be tolerable certainty, there is lack of evidence which can be in any respects regarded as certain; so that conjecture is the only alternative. And yet, although the quest seems apparently to fail in its object, it sheds abundant light on the aspect of Josephus as a historian, and the historical method which he employed.

<sup>17</sup> Vita 10-12. <sup>18</sup> Ant. XX 224-251.

Note I.Did Josephus know Latin ?

Although it is not stated explicitly anywhere that Josephus understood Latin, it is inherently probable that this was the case. He lived in Rome permanently from about 71 A.D. (after the Fall of Jerusalem. 70 A.D.) onwards, up to the time of his death, which was at least after 100 A.D. He thus came into contact with Romans for upwards of thirty years, and to assume that in these circumstances Josephus did not learn to understand even a little Latin is hazardous. For Josephus picked up Greek with commendable speed and accuracy, so that he was able to translate his Aramaic "Jewish War" into Greek about 75 A.D. Many Jews were, and still are, under the necessity of learning, besides their native Aramaic, at least one non-Semitic language. It seems a national characteristic which they possess, to learn foreign languages with ease. There is no reason to suppose that Josephus was unlike the average Jew: indeed, his precocious talent as a youth (Vita 9) makes it appear as if he had the characteristics of the Jews to a remarkable degree.

Further, the following points are noteworthy:-

(1). Suetonius (Claudius.16) says that Claudius deprived a man of Roman citizenship because he did not know Latin. It is not known when or if this enactment was superseded, but it is interesting as showing the attitude of an Emperor during whose Principate (41-54 A.D.) Josephus was alive, although he did not come to stay in Rome until twenty or more years later.

(2). Commentarii (Ὑπομνήματα) are mentioned in Vita.342. (the Commentaries of Vespasian".) and Vita 358 ( "-- of Caesar".), and Contra Apionem I.56 ("-- of the Emperors".) The references can hardly mean anything else but that Josephus had read these "Commentarii" which must have been in Latin.

(3). All the Imperial Edicts which Josephus gives cannot have been in Greek originally. Many of the decrees passed in favour of the Jews are given in Ant. XIV. 190 - 264. Josephus says twice that they



are on "bronze slabs in the Capitolium". (Ant. XIV.188.266.) It is there that Josephus must have seen them, and, even if they were translated into Greek for the benefit of Greek-speaking communities to which they were addressed, (compare for example, the Monumentum Ancyranum.) the copies in the Capitoline would be the Latin originals. Again, Ant. XIV. 228 *λευκίῳ λεύκῳ γίῳ μαρκέλλῳ* is not a Greek expression, but an Ablative Absolute transliterated into the Greek Dative - a proof that the original was in Latin.

(4). Ant. XVIII. 195. "The Romans call this bird "bubo". Such a phrase implies an extensive Latin vocabulary and is conclusive. There is thus evidence that Josephus had a reading knowledge of Latin, amply sufficient to deal with Latin sources.

The Theory of a "Thucydidean assistant", who was responsible for  
Ant. XVII - XIX.

The theory has been put forward by the late Dr. Thackeray that Josephus' 'Jewish Antiquities' Books XVII-XIX, although published under the name of Josephus, are not from his pen at all, but were actually written by an "assistant" (*συνεργός*) who is nameless, yet recognisable in all but name. His starting-point is the "Bellum Judaicum", which possesses "extraordinary merits", he says, and can justly claim a high place in literature. This work, written when Josephus was about forty years of age, and after he had lived in Rome during the space of a very few years, is indeed surprising, considering that Josephus was a Jewish priest and a ~~Parisian~~<sup>Platonic</sup>, living in Rome, and not yet sufficiently conversant with Greek in the polished style of the B.J.<sup>2</sup> The clue to the solution of the problem was given about twenty years later, when in the "Contra Apionem", his last work, Josephus admits that he employed "assistants" for the Greek.<sup>3</sup> Thackeray now proceeds to the "Jewish Antiquities", first published c.94 A.D., and notes that in the prologue<sup>4</sup> Josephus says he was beset with doubts at the thought of writing a history from the Creation to the outbreak of the War with Rome, thus connecting with the B.J. At the end of Ant. XIV, he claims to find further signs of flagging interest in the huge task, at the point of the rise of Antipater and Herod, with which the B.J. also dealt incidentally. In Ant. XV. and XVI. Thackeray finds indications of fresh vocabulary, including poetical words, reminiscent of Sophocles. After enumerating them, he infers that, since the author was now tired with his theme, he handed it over to "assistants", and the signs of one are to be found in Ant. XV. and XVI: he is the "Sophoclean assistant", (see Appendix 4) a man of culture and refinement, steeped in the language and thought of Sophocles. But in Ant. XVII, Thackeray notices still another change. The "Sophoclean assistant" is no longer to be detected, but this does not mean that Josephus himself took up the thread again here: there are other non-Josephan characteristics, he says, extending throughout Ant. XVII-XIX, of a more coarse type, less refined than those of the elegant "Sophoclean".

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, the Man and the Historian, pp. 104-114. <sup>2</sup> Cf. Ant. XX. 203, for the difficulties he experienced with the language. <sup>3</sup> Contra Ap. I. 50. <sup>4</sup> Ant. I. 6-8.

He enumerates these, and since the characteristics can be paralleled from Thucydides, he thus identifies the second "assistant" a pedantic Thucydidean "hack", with rough mannerisms of style.

In the XXth. book, there is a return to the normal style of the rest of the Antiquities, he says, showing that Josephus had now brought himself to add the final chapters to his "magnum opus".

Such is the theory: it is, at first sight, an attractive one. In its favour, it should certainly be said that it sees the peculiarities of the style in these books of the Antiquities, and having appreciated them, proceeds to give an explanation of them in a manner which is consistent with the evidence. The phrases, for example, at the beginning of Ant. XVII. are startling, and there is a natural tendency, when once they have been noticed, for the reader to agree with Thackeray's explanation of them: the more startling the phenomena, the greater the tendency to accept a suggested solution, since it is the phenomena in question which primarily arouse attention. But, looking at the theory once more, we must ask what is the evidence in support of it, and in doing this, it is not inadmissible to take general considerations first. It is admitted without doubt that Josephus availed himself of the use of assistants when translating the B.J. from its Aramaic original: if his circumstances are taken into consideration, it is hard to see how he could have done otherwise. The first occasion on which he would have any need of Greek was during his first visit to Rome, and even then he had with him in Rome a Jewish actor-friend, who may have been sometimes his interpreter. Then after Jotapata he was with the Romans as interpreter, at the Siege of Jerusalem, finally coming to live in Rome, under Trajan's patronage. The B.J. was written almost immediately after this. It is agreed that for the polished style of this work, Josephus could not have been entirely responsible: not that Josephus was ignorant of Greek by the time he wrote the B.J., but he had not the scholarly experience in it which distinguishes the mere every-day spoken word from the



polished literary composition. The "Jewish Antiquities", on the other hand, was not written until an interval of about twenty years had elapsed. During the whole of this time Josephus had lived in Rome, and as he says, applied himself to the study of Greek literature. He says, in effect, in the passage that his fellow Jews admitted his expert knowledge of Aramaic, and that he applied himself to Greek Literature, both prose and poetry, with much diligence "having memorized grammatical experience". This is the literal translation of τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐμπειρίαν ἀναδιδόντων ἀναδιδόντων here can hardly mean anything else but memorize, "learn by rote" (L. & S.<sup>6</sup>): the participle is used of something subsequent - a use not unheard of in earlier Greek, and found in Josephus elsewhere, e.g. Ant. XX. 204. διαφθερίσας - and means "and thus I memorized, later". The meaning is that Josephus studied Greek literature and ultimately succeeded in mastering and committing to memory the rules of grammar and syntax which he saw illustrated in the Greek literature he read. The thorough learning of Greek after Aramaic may well have needed diligence, as would the learning of Aramaic by a Greek. The one difficulty which he could not easily surpass was that of "pronunciation" (τὴν αἰεὶ τὴν ἀποφθερὴν ἰκτερίαν) but that did not affect his written style. This being Josephus' statement, (and there is no evidence that it is untrue) it is unreasonable to think that he was in the same position with regard to his Greek in, say, 90 A.D., as he was in 70 A.D., for he had not only studied it, but he was, if we can believe his own statements (e.g. Vita. 9.) a man of good talents and education. It was probably the appearance of Justus' History of the War that made Josephus insert this passage, (it belongs probably to the second edition of the Ant., when the Vita was added to the Ant., after 100 A.D., attacking and refuting Justus.) because Justus himself was ὡς ἀντιπρὸς ἀνιδεῶς τῆς αἰ' ἑλλήνων (Vita. 40). And, as it is necessary to-day for most Jews to know thoroughly at least two languages, so it was the case in the first century A.D., as well.

Thus these considerations go against the theory of "assistants",

<sup>5</sup> Ant. xx. 263. <sup>6</sup> Liddell and Scott (new edition) give 15 literary examples: - Arrian Epictetus. II. 16. 5; Alexander Aphrodisias in Porphyry's A. ad 7. 2; in Top. 44. 31; ὡς ἀντιπρὸς ἀνιδεῶς (Ant. xx. 263), perhaps an echo of ἀνιδεῶς (Vita. 338).

for about 90 A.D., at the outset, even if Josephus was weary of his task - a statement which is not proved by direct evidence. Even assuming that Thackeray's theory is right, he still has to explain why in the "Antiquities" Josephus needed "assistants", while in the "Contra Apionem", written almost immediately after it, he did not, even on Thackeray's admission avail himself of them. It is almost as if Josephus in those few years suddenly made the progress which he had for twenty years previously been vainly trying to make.

One of the important passages on which the theory is built is "Contra Ap." I. 50: in that context, however, Josephus appears to be speaking expressly of the B.J. In the context his theme had been the composition of history in general, and the abuses of it, and he cites the "Jewish War" as an example, (§ 46) showing that he himself had the necessary qualifications - which so many historians in his view have not: the description of his method of composition brings, in a participial clause, his account of "assistants" being used: in § 57, he apologises for this "necessary" digression on the B.J.

Thus there is no evidence in Josephus himself for the use of "assistants" in the "Antiquities"; rather does his statement suggest that the "assistants" were a characteristic of the B. J., which distinguishes it from subsequent works.

General considerations then may be said to be against the theory, which is not supported by any evidence in Josephus himself. The ultimate test, however, is the style: if the style in these books is proved to be thoroughly unlike that of Josephus in the rest of the "Antiquities", the theory finds support, in spite of general arguments to the contrary, but if the style is proved to be nevertheless that of Josephus, the theory must be discounted. Since it is the unusual <sup>first</sup> which so often arrests the attention, the unusual characteristics of XVII - XIX may be first examined. That they do exist, and are reminiscent of Thucydides, Thackeray rightly maintained.



8

I. Of direct reminiscences from Thucydides, Thackeray mentions σὶ ἀρετῆς τὴν μεγαλοσύμῳσι (Thuc. II. 51.), which is found in Ant. XVIII. 20.278, end with variations in XVII. 153 (ὀρίγυνάσθην) and XVII. 149. 181. (ἡροσασίγος). There is also in Ant. XVII. 156 δορὶ μάλλον ἀμάρει ἢ ἡρόσιος ἀσφαλεῖ, an echo of Thuc. IV. 108. 4. τὸ δὲ εἰς τὸν βουλήσιν κρινόντες ἀσφαλεῖ ἢ ἡρόσιος ἀσφαλεῖ so too Ant. XVII. 216. βούη καὶ διακτελεσμήν ἡρώσιος was perhaps inspired by Thuc. IV. 11. 3. ἡροσασίγος τὴν ἀσφῶν ἡρώσιος καὶ διακτελεσμήν (cf. Ant. XIX. 110.): Ant. XVII. 74. ἐπὶ κλασθέντι τῇ θύρῳ (cf. Ant. XVIII. 275 ἐπὶ κλασθέντι) is reminiscent of Thuc. IV. 37. ἐπὶ κλασθέντι τῇ γυνώμῃ (cf. Thuc. III. 59; III. 67.); so too Ant. XVII. 215. τοῦ μανιώδους, may be an echo of Thuc. IV. 39. καὶ τοῦ κλέωνος κῆντε μανιώδης οὐδὲ ἢ ὑπόσχετος ἀνέβη. otherwise, the only important reference to μανιώδης is Euripides. Bacchae. 299.

II. A form of meiosis in Thuc. I. 138 οὐκ ἀνῆλλετο is found itself fourteen times in these books: synonymous phrases on the same model e.g. οὐκ ἀνδοτέρωμῳσι, οὐκ ἀνδολεμῳσι occur nine times: in the short passage Ant. XVII. 32 - 39 no less than five instances of οὐκ ἀνῆλλετο (ἀνδοτέρωμῳσι) occur.

III. To judge from Niese's edition, the Thucydidean 'σσ' instead of the later Attic 'ττ', is to be seen also, since the manuscripts preserve 'σσ' in these books more frequently than anywhere else in the work. It is to be noted, however, that Naber reads 'ττ' in almost every case, without, for the most part, expressing his reasons, or stating his authority: there are ten cases where Naber retains the 'σσ' form: Niese, on the other hand, has 'σσ' in almost every case, with twenty-three exceptions, where he keeps the Attic 'ττ'. In some of these exceptions, his critical notes show that some manuscripts have 'σσ', though they are, to Niese's mind, less trustworthy: - e.g. κρεῖττόνων Ant. XIX. 221. (κρεῖσσόνων Hw. etc. Niese, note ad loc.)

IV. There is found in Thucydides the use of τό with the neuter singular of the Present Participle, as an abstract noun, instead of



the more usual τό with the Infinitive, e.g. Thuc. I. 142. ὡς τῷ π  
 μὴ μελετῶντι : II. 36. τὸ μὲν δεξιός : V. 102. μὲν τοῦ ἀρμαίνου : V. 9. τοῦ  
 ὑπασπῆστη πλεόν ἢ τοῦ μένοντος (a combination of the two.)

The usage which is also found in Sophocles<sup>9</sup> is comparable with the  
 use of τό and the Neuter of an adjective, e.g. Thuc. IV. 62. τὸ δὲ  
 ἀσπιδόμητον τοῦ μέλλοντος (cf. III. 59.). In Josephus Ant. XVII-  
 XIX this Thucydidean characteristic is copied in over sixty cases. The  
 original construction, as found in Thucydides, and probably first  
 adopted by him for written composition, is found at least twenty-eight  
 instances. In these books, Josephus even extends the construction,  
 by the use of the neuter singular of the future participle with  
 τό (e.g. Ant. XVII. 1. διὰ τὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μὴ ὑπεκινεῖσθαι) ;  
 he also, by way of extension, adds a genitive, closely connected with  
 the verb of which the participle is being used with τό, and  
 generally put between article and the participle. (e.g. Ant. XVII. 1.  
 τῶν ἀδελφῶν : XVIII. 145 τὸ μὴ μετρητῶν σωρῶν ὑποτιθέμενον :  
 XVIII. 148 τὸ τοῦ Ἀγρίππας ἀρσβουλεύσαντος) These variations from  
 the original construction are in fact equally as numerous as the  
 examples of the original, simple one, numbering roughly half of the  
 total.

These then are the more striking characteristics of Ant. XVII-XIX,  
 which are directly reminiscent of Thucydides. Turning now to the  
 remainder, we find some equally striking, though they cannot with such  
 confidence be ascribed directly and solely to Thucydides.

V. A long periphrastic phrase οὐδὲν (μὴδὲν) εἰς ἀναβολὴν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ  
 ὀφέως, is found in full five times in these books: frequently,  
 however, it is broken up into οὐδὲν εἰς ἀναβολὴν, and ἐκ τοῦ ὀφέως,  
 of which the former occurs three times, and the latter twelve times.  
 Thackeray sees an echo of Thuc. VII. 15 εὐθὺς καὶ μὴ εἰς ἀναβολὴν :  
 even so, the use of the phrase divided up, and ἐκ τοῦ ὀφέως, seem  
 to be an extension of the characteristic by Josephus himself.

VI. κουφίζω (and its compounds and derivative noun) is to be  
 found six times in these books. The word is found in Thucydides,<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Soph. Ph. 674, Tr. 196. <sup>10</sup> Thuc. VI. 34, II. 44.

but it is not a characteristic word of Thucydides only, being found in many other writers, Sophocles, Euripides, Plutarch and others.

VII. In the sense of "advance", "progress", ἀρκεῖν occurs seven times in Ant. XVIII. As in VI, (καυφίχης), ἀρκεῖν is found in Thucydides,<sup>11</sup> among other writers.

VIII. There are six cases of the use of ἀποστείλεν - "send for" - in these books of Josephus. Thucydides too seems to use the Active and Middle indiscriminately.<sup>12</sup> The middle voice is also used in Josephus in these books, e.g. Ant. XVIII. 237. ἀποστέλλειν.

IX. Forms of ἀφαιρέω are found nine times in the absolute use, "removal"; hence "death". A fragment of Euripides<sup>13</sup> affords a parallel to this usage.

From special phrases and words, we may turn to the more ordinary characteristics.

X. Examples of the use of Perfect or Pluperfect Tenses where an Aorist may have been expected are very numerous: there are over fifteen cases in each of these books.

XI. Cases of participles not adequately connected and subordinated, sometimes also with unexpected tenses, e.g. Ant. XVIII. 99. ἀποφύγοντες... ἐκείνους : XVIII. 105. τὰς ἀφαιρέσεις... ἐκείνους.

XII. Cases of participles especially in Genitive Absolute clauses, coming after the main verb, giving the impression of being an anti-climax, e.g. Ant. XVII. 155. ἀποφύγοντες... ἐκείνους.

XIII. Of connecting particles, some sentences lack them altogether, some have inadequate particles, e.g. καὶ or ὅτι alone, others have the particle put late in the sentence. These usages can be found paralleled in both Thucydides and Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

XIV. ὡς with an abstract noun is frequently used to express purpose. There are about seventy examples at least in these books alone: very frequently too in other expressions, abstract nouns are found where Classical Greek would almost certainly have used more concrete constructions.

XV. The pleonastic use of the Pluperfect with ὡς in the Apodosis

<sup>11</sup> Thuc. IV. 60 : VII. 56. <sup>12</sup> Liddell and Scott. I. s. ἀποστέλλειν. <sup>13</sup> Eur. fr. 558.



of a Past Conditional Sentence, with "Implication" is found six times. Strictly, an aorist + <sup>2/</sup> would be expected.

Thus we have most of the important characteristics of Ant. XVII - XIX, including those which Thackeray educes in favour of his theory, but the more general ones as well. Given this list, containing the evidence, it remains to see how to interpret this evidence correctly. So that the ultimate decision rests largely upon a consideration of the style of other books, admitted by all to have been written by Josephus with his own hand: Ant. XX. and the Vita, for example, may be taken as indisputable products of Josephus' own pen.

The presence of verbal imitation of Thucydides (I) is not apparent elsewhere in the Antiquities besides in XVII - XIX: nor is the particular form of meiosis which becomes so popular especially in Ant. XVII. 32 - 39 (II), found in Ant. XX. or Vita. So far the evidence supports Thackeray's interpretation of the evidence. Turning to the question of - 'σσ' and 'ττ', (III) it is noticeable that Naber reads 'ττ' in every case in Ant. XX. and Vita in addition to Ant. XVII - XIX, except in Ant. XX. 90. γὰρ ἄνθρωπον, while Niese still shows his preference for the 'σσ' form. The inference must be that the presence of 'σσ' in Ant. XVII - XIX, assuming Niese's readings to be correct, is not by any means confined to those books. Thackeray would then have to say that the characteristic of the "assistant" in Ant. XVII - XIX is identical with the normal style of Josephus in Ant. XX. and Vita. The use of το and the Neuter of the Present Participle Singular (IV) is not confined to Ant. XVII-XIX, in the same way, e.g. Ant. XII. 59. τὸ πῶς βασιλεὺς διαβέβηκεν : XIII. 151. τὸ λαοῦν ..... τὸ ἀφελῆσθαι : XIII. 295. ἀπὸς τὸ δοκῶν : XVI. 404. τῷ μηδ' ἐκένει περὶ μὲν . The extension of the Thucydidean usage, culminating in, e.g. Ant. XVIII. 280, ἵνα πῶς ὁμαλῶς καὶ ἀπολαυστέως πομπῆς ὄντων - surely the strangest Greek phrase in any author - admittedly occurs in Ant. XVII-XIX, but



the presence of the simpler form elsewhere makes it probable that the same author was responsible for all of them, both simple and complex. Words and phrases occurring fairly frequently for a time in a limited space in a work (e.g. V. VI. VII. VIII.) do not necessarily prove of themselves that it is another hand which is responsible for them. They may perhaps go to swell the list of peculiarities which may be ascribed to a second author, when there is direct evidence for his activity at a certain point, apart from stylistic considerations, but of themselves without any such direct evidence, they can hardly allow any such interpretation. As regards IX, *μὴδὲν* (and derivatives) is found also in Vita 423 - *τῆς ἐκ τοῦ βίου μετὰ τὴν* a fact which suggests that the same author wrote both Vita and Ant. XVII - XIX.

Although special characteristics are striking, yet the general customary style and the characteristics of it must be weighed in the balance with them. - (e.g. X. XI. XII. XIII. XIV. XV. ) The presence of numerous examples of ordinary stylistic characteristics, e.g. use of tenses (X) - over sixteen examples in each book - , participles (XI. and XII.), connecting particles (XIII.), and abstracts (XIV) - when supported by equally numerous examples from other books, cannot fail to indicate that the same author was responsible for all. Each of these general points of style mentioned (X. - XV.) are found not only in Ant. XVII - XIX, but in Ant. XX. and Vita. For example, the passages where the pleonastic use of the pluperfect with *ἔσθ'* is found in the apodosis of a past condition with "Implication" (XV.) are these :- Ant. XVII. 184. 275. XVIII. 181. XIX. 15. 252. 263. Ant. XX. 182. Vita. 96, 262, 343. To say that because of unusual characteristics a second hand is responsible for them, seems to omit the explanation of ordinary characteristics altogether; while to say from numerous ordinary characteristics that the same hand is responsible is reasonable. This may omit the entire explanation of the unusual and striking, but it is a fuller explanation than the assumption of a second hand, because general characteristics

are more numerous. And when evidence is forthcoming that some of the striking characteristics are extensions of general ones (e.g. IV), we seem to reach not only further proof that one author wrote all, but also a clue which may lead to the full explanation of the striking characteristics.

The conclusion then is that while Thackeray's explanation of a Thucydidean assistant for these unusual phrases may explain those phrases alone, it does not explain enough, and cannot account for the presence of general similarities between Ant. XVII-XIX and Ant. XX. and Vita. If the "Thucydidean assistant" were a reality it would surely be expected that, being a "slavish imitator" of his model, he would, at least, have used the thoroughly Thucydidean { for σ , e.g. { ὅν for ὅν , and ἐς for ἐς . But there is no sign of these in Ant. XVII - XIX.

"Thucydides was the natural standard of historical style".<sup>14</sup> No doubt then Josephus studied it:<sup>15</sup> an interest in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who was one of his sources, and who had written himself on the style of Thucydides, would also encourage him to study it. This makes it natural, if not almost expected, to find traces of Thucydides in Josephus, without ascribing them to an "assistant". The above phrase of Thackeray, then, while intended to make plausible his hypothesis, in reality makes it less probable in itself. It always seems difficult, even when there are known to be joint authors, to pick out the parts for which each was responsible. The task is easier, for example, in a Gilbert and Sullivan opera, where each is known to have taken one particular sphere, but no one can pick out Shakespeare's work in "The Two Noble Kinsmen", which he wrote with Fletcher. Unascribed reminiscences and quotations do not allow one to put them down to an "assistant". How much less then should an "assistant" be posited for Josephus, who wrote at a time when notions of plagiarism were notoriously different from those of to-day? One could have expected attempts

<sup>14</sup> Dr. Thackeray: p. 110. <sup>15</sup> cf. Ant. xx. 262.



to distinguish the work of the "assistants" in B.J., however great the probabilities against their plausibility: but the attempt to distinguish "assistants" in the Antiquities is unexpected, and doomed to failure.

Josephus then wrote Ant. XVII - XIX himself. To be entirely adequate, this view needs an explanation of the curious phrases. Thackeray holds that the peculiarities hold right through the three books. So far as a limit can be set in the circumstances, the peculiarities in style seem to become less striking half way through

the eighteenth book: for example, in Ant. XVIII. 144. is found

τῆς φύξης τὸ βέλον : 145. εἰς τὸ μὴ μῆλ' ἔν τῷ πρῶτῳ ἀρτίονον : 147 ἢ  
 ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς τὸ μεταστροφῆς αὐτοῦ : 148 τὸ τ' αὖτε τῶν ὁρίων : 150 Ἀγρίονα  
 ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ὁδὸν

Here the extension seems to reach its peak;

after that there seems to be a change, although the phrase is still found, e.g. XVIII. 280. - εἰς τὸ δὲ δαμῆναι μὴ ἀνὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τοιοῦτον ὁρῶν

By Ant. XIX, at the latest, the style appears to have become almost like that of Ant. XX and Vita. The explanation may

be that Josephus took a phrase, worked upon it, perhaps even extended it - all this in the comparatively short space of two or so books at most. So, for example, ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς is found seven times in Ant. XVIII,

and not in XVII or XIX: ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ἀποφύγει : 285 is found three times<sup>16</sup> between Ant. XVIII. 285, and XIX. 248. This is not a peculiarity of Josephus only; it is known, for example, that Livy is prone to use an expression several times in a few pages, and then drop it. Thus the full explanation may be partly a psychological one: the author, either at the time of writing, or during revision, sees a phrase or invents one by extension from another well-known one; being bizarre, the phrase remains uppermost in his mind, and as he works, he uses it again and again, until another phrase strikes him. It is noticeable that when the violent extension of Thucydides' original phrase, τὸ with Neuter Singular of the Present Participle begins to cease a little, Josephus already has another, e.g. ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς in his mind: by the time

<sup>16</sup> Ant. XVIII. 285, XIX. 77. XIX. 248.



that he has used this a little, ὡς (ἢ ὡς) ἀποκρίσει is appearing. It may be a conscious or an unconscious process. Josephus was constantly revising his works, and the publishing side of authorship was well advanced in the time of Josephus, who had Epaphroditus as his patron and publisher. The "Jewish Antiquities" and the "Vita" were meant finally to be one integral whole : the Vita was written after 100 A.D.,<sup>17</sup> but the Antiquities contains two separate endings in Ant. XX. 259 and XX. 267 - the latter giving the date 94 A.D.<sup>18</sup> The only real explanation of these points is to posit a second edition, published after 100 A.D., also. That such an inconsistency should be allowed to remain is due perhaps not so much to carelessness, as to the fact that Josephus could only add to, and not take away from, his first edition. It would have been impossible to recall all copies of the first edition in circulation for deletions to be made, and at that time a second edition must have contained additions only.

Into this second edition then Josephus introduced these characteristics in Ant. XVII - middle of Ant. XVIII: they were composed of peculiar phrases and tricks of a style, occurring very frequently for a time, and then ceasing, one being then taken up by another. But their evolution hinted at above, shows that he at least fondly imagined that the style of these characteristics was good. Why then did Josephus choose these particular books for revision, and why did he only go so far with it ? This is the most difficult problem. There is no evidence to decide, only conjecture; the explanation may be purely subjective - Josephus felt that revision should be made and started more or less at random with Ant. XVII. But a hint is also given by the subject matter; Ant. XVII reaches up to the death of Herod (XVII. 191.) so that about this point a change of source would be necessary. Josephus may possibly have been dissatisfied with the style of his narrative in Ant. XVII and XVIII, where the change of source occurred. For the second edition, he may therefore have taken the opportunity of doing some revision of the

<sup>17</sup>Vita 359, death of Agrippa II (100 A.D. &c Photius) assumed. <sup>18</sup>"13th year of Domitian".

arts he felt stood in need of it. Further, after 100 A.D., Justus' 'History' appeared, the author of which was admittedly an expert on style. And so, with some natural tendency to opposite extremes which is so frequent, Josephus re-polished, and over-polished Ant. XVII and XVIII - the books on the style of which he felt diffident. Thus the Vita refuted Justus' claims to accuracy, and the revision of Ant. XVII - XVIII (middle), ensured, to Josephus' satisfaction, that Justus could not attack his works now, either B. J. or Ant., on the score of accuracy or style.

Such an explanation of the characteristics, it should be emphasized, is only a conjecture in a realm where only conjecture, at present is permissible. The considerations above stated make Dr. Thackeray's theory of the use of "assistants" in the latter books of the Jewish Antiquities both improbable and unnecessary.

The "Assistants" of the Bellum Judaicum (B.J.)

In the "Contra Apionem", in a digression intended to "expose the recklessness of those who undertake to write histories",<sup>1</sup> Josephus specifically states,<sup>2</sup> "I employed some collaborateurs (συγγράμματα) to be quite au fait in the Greek idioms, and so composed my history of those transactions". (i.e. the Bellum Judaicum.) The admission was made more than twenty years after the composition of the work. When, in the "Jewish Antiquities",<sup>3</sup> Josephus makes the confident claim that "no other person, whether he were a Jew or a foreigner, had he ever so great inclination to it, could so accurately <sup>have</sup> deliver <sup>ed</sup> these accounts to the Greeks as is done in these books", and "with much labour I was diligent to attain to some knowledge of Greek prose literature and poetical works, and I acquired by rote familiarity with literary language", we cannot reject the statements as false, even if they are not, by our standards, in the best of taste, because he had then been more than twenty years in Rome, and had had time to master Greek thoroughly. But the tardy admission in the Contra Apionem immediately brings up such questions as "Why did Josephus need "assistants" for the B.J.; how much did they write of the work, and to what extent did he use their assistance?" The late Dr. Thackeray said of the συγγράμματα,<sup>4</sup> "their names and social status are unrecorded", and he inclined to the view that they were slaves, and not the author's "literary friends in Rome": <sup>and</sup> because of "Sophoclean" reminiscences, especially frequent, in his view, in the third book of the B.J. he identifies one "assistant" as the "Sophoclean" who according to his theory shared in the composition of Ant. XV - XVI. There are, however, grave objections to the theory of "assistants" for the "Antiquities", a fact which, in itself, goes against the further identification of the "Sophoclean" assistant in the B.J. To study the "assistants", it is necessary to compare the B.J., in the composition of which they were employed, with the "Antiquities" and, having noted any differences or similarities, to come to a conclusion in the light of them.

<sup>1</sup> I. sy. Shiller. Whiston. John Library. <sup>2</sup> I. 50. <sup>3</sup> xx. 262ff. Whiston. <sup>4</sup> Josephus, II. H. J. R. & the Antiquities, p. 105.



Many of the constructions and words characteristic of the "Antiquities" can be found in the B.J. (1) The absence of connecting particles in the "Antiquities" is very frequent, and, indeed, can be said to be a characteristic of Josephus. Such a use of asyndeton, particularly, prevents him from beginning the narrative of a story, event, or description, with the idiomatic  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}$  : he generally has  $\tau\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  , or some form of it, as the opening word of the sentence, without further connecting particle. e.g. Ant. XV. 18.  $\tau\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  .....  $\tau\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  : XVI. 328. In other cases, when a description is given, or a speech, or decree, he frequently picks up the narrative with  $\tau\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  (or a similar form of  $\tau\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  ) with no particle. e.g. Ant. XI. 215.  $\tau\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  τοῦ Ἀρμένου ἀφ' ὧσαντος : 234.  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$  ἰκελευσθε τὸν θ\omicron\iota\omicron\iota : XII. 262. 285. 287. XIII. 201. XIV. 9.29.77.184. XV. 47. 80. 96. 123. XVI. 73. 130. 325. 351. 367. XVII.26.60.106. XVIII. 101. 284. XX. 3. 46. 60. Such examples are only a selection of many other typical ones, and, except for the fact that in Ant. XIX the examples seem to be less numerous, there is uniformity in the "Antiquities" in the use of asyndeton. But this is not to say that Josephus does not use any connecting particles: indeed, he frequently uses  $\delta\epsilon$  .  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}$  .  $\gamma\epsilon$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  .  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  .  $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\alpha}$  and these, sometimes with  $\tau\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  ,  $\tau\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  etc. e.g. Ant. XX. 113. B.J.II.162.167. VII. 54. Even so, Josephus' use of them is at times by no means neat, e.g. Ant. XIII. 44. 130.- the odd use of  $\tau\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  second word: at other times the particle he uses is inadequate. e.g.  $\tau\omicron$  and  $\tau\epsilon$  alone,  $\delta\epsilon$  put late in the sentence. Similarly, in the B.J., the particles are used in the same way. e.g.  $\tau\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  etc. I. 629. II. 33. 64. IV. 103. 601. 639. V. 126, 420. 459. **VI.** 54. VII. 348. 389. :  $\tau\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  etc. I. 30. 31. 75. 80. 179. II. 141. 175. 203. 209. 212. 214. III. 66. 124. 173. 175. 218. IV. 25. 128. 158. 193. 226. V. 109. 148. 188. 191. 318. 375. VI. 98. 111. 121. 129. 134. 202. 285. VII. 26. 39. 171. 189. 201. 241. (2) Another marked general feature of the "Antiquities" is the use of the Perfect or Pluperfect Tenses, where the Aorist would have been more

idiomatically used. So too, participles are not neatly used, not being adequately subordinated, and with the tenses not strictly formed, so that the sentences tend to lose their climax which should be found in the main verb: this is particularly noticeable in genitive absolute constructions, so used that the clause thus formed appears to hang lamely as <sup>an</sup> ~~the~~ anti-climax. (3) An abstract method of expression is likewise characteristic, particularly in the construction of <sup>ἵνα</sup> with the Dative of an abstract noun to express purpose, and <sup>ποῦ</sup> with the accusative of an abstract noun to express the equivalent of the corresponding verb.

(4) There is also a curious order of words, a form of "Involution", which is characteristic of him. e.g. Ant. XX. 10. τὰτα γὰρ ἐκείνου  
ἀσθεν δ' ἰώσαντος : 135. εἰ μὴ περ (Ynesis) Vita 338. Ἰουδαίους γὰρ συνήγαγον  
τὰς περὶ τοῦτον ἐπικυρήσας ἀρχαίας τὸν εὐλαβέον . B. J. IV. 352. τοῦτων ἀπολογ-  
εῖσθαι ἀπὸ : I. 242 καὶ πρὸς τὸν οὐκ ὀλίγους Ἀντώνιον χεῖματιν . I. 64. αὐτοῦ  
ὅτι Ἡρώδου κτισθεῖσα τοῦ βασιλέως .

These are the main general characteristics of Josephus' style in the "Antiquities", examples of which occur again and again. Abundant parallels may likewise be found for each of these characteristics in the B.J. The evidence thus obtained is important, as showing the predominance of Josephus' style in the B.J., but, since some of the general characteristics can be paralleled in Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (e.g. "loose" use of participles, in the latter author, and, occasionally, omission of connecting particles in both authors) this evidence is not entirely conclusive of itself. If, however, the language and vocabulary in the "Antiquities" and B.J. show considerable similarities and parallels, then this evidence, added to the evidence already obtained from the general characteristics of the two works, will become conclusive and certain. ἀσφάλεια (= ἀσφάλεια) is found in each of the seven books of the B.J., and appears in Ant. XIII. 99. 161. XIV. 427. XVIII. 285. XIX. 199. 248 - the use of the word being probably imitated from Dion. Hal. (1.81: 3.5.12: 9.12.5.) :



ἐρεθίζω is found in each of five books of the B.J. and throughout the Ant. (e.g. XVIII. 146. 336. XIX. 320. Vita. 149, 151, 231. 298.): the phrase ἀφροντᾶ θεῷ, in each of six books of the B.J., occurs characteristically in, e.g. Ant. XVII. 9. 181. XVIII. 197. 289. 319. XIX. 38. 39. and other books. So too ἡρεμῶ (in each book of the B.J.) and Ant. e.g. XIV. 410. XV. 6. Vita. 28: δραστηρίως (in each of five books of the B.J.) and e.g. in Ant. XIII. 407. XIV. 8. 13: ἐνωργυρία in four books of B.J. and in Ant. XIII. (284). 288. 394: κακοεργυρία in each of three books of B.J. and in Ant. XIII. 376: οὐτις δέος in four books of B.J., and, e.g. in Ant. XIV. 275.: ἀροκόω (intransitive) in five books of B.J., and, especially, in Ant. XVIII. 6. 142. 181. 289. 317. 339. 340: φιλοφρονήσις in two books of B.J., and e.g. in Ant. XIII. 189: σκάνις (-ίζω) in five books of the B.J., and e.g. in Ant. XIII. 3. XIV. 390. 391. 406. 475: ἀρροσέχω (without τὸν νοῦν) in six books of B.J. and e.g. in Ant. XIII. 303. XIV. 14. 351: σί (etc.) τὰ πνύς φροντύντες (etc.) in three books of B.J. and often in Ant. e.g. XIII. 4. 28. 377. XIV. 58. 90. 131. 157. 268. 450: ἀγλαυμένους in three books of B.J., and in Ant. XIII. XIV., and, especially, in XVII-XIX.: αἰθύνιος in three books of B.J., and in Ant. XIII. 201: αἰθερέω in two books of B.J. and in Ant. XIII. 189. 408. XIV. 41: ἀειροκτονία B.J. I: 606 (cf. II. 211) Ant. XIII. 314: αἰθερέ B.J. I. 478. Ant. XVI. 322: ηθίς B.J. I. 446. 477. 534. Ant. XVI. 322: ημερέω B.J. I. 591. Ant. II. 79: (ἡμερέω) εἰρίζω B.J. I. 647. Ant. XIV. 296: ἡλυσώρη B.J. III. 232. Ant. I. 50: νηφώ B.J. IV. 42. V. 229. Ant. XI. 42: γόης ἀνὴρ B.J. IV. 85 cf Ant. XVII. 226. (Ant. XVIII. 63), contrast B.J. V. 317: ἀνιχεός B.J. IV. 207. Ant. XIII. 72: πῆς δερῆς τὸ ἀπαμύντον B.J. IV. 44. cf. Ant. XIX. 319: τὴν ἀπαμύντον ἀφροσιν (εἰλα): συνενόημα B.J. V. 164. 175. Ant. XIII. 96: στύλος B.J. V. 180. Ant. XIII. 211: δασμός B.J. V. 187. 405. Ant. XIII. 246.: ῥομφαία B.J. VI. 86. 224. 289. Ant. VI. 254: ὑπερθεῶ B.J. VI. 124. Ant. VII. 46: λιμώσσω B.J. VI. 213. 321. 433. Ant. XIV. 80.: σφίλεος B.J. VI. 395. II. 444. Ant. XIV. 45: ἀμύλει B.J. I. 121. 351. II. 450. IV. 397. V. 36. 86. 119. 445. VI. 34. Ant. VII. 75. IX. 77. X. 45. XI. 45. 169. XII. 167. 315. XIII. 131. Contra Ap. I. 46. II. 152. 222. All these

References from Dr. Thackeray 'Lexicon to Josephus', Part I. A - ἀλφός.



examples give strong support to the view that Josephus' own style and vocabulary of the "Antiquities" is to be found predominating in the B.J. In fact, in the last book of the B.J., the style and vocabulary seem to have no words, phrases or constructions which could not well have come from Josephus' own pen : the book is exactly like Ant.XX. This extreme similarity and lack of any appreciable difference led the late Dr. Thackeray to suggest that towards the end of the B.J., after experience in the "translation" of the earlier books, Josephus worked unaided in the seventh and last. The many characteristics of Josephus found already in Books I - VI-which, however, Thackeray would not have allowed,- make the suggestion still more probable, because even in Books I - VI most of the style is that of Josephus, and so to write the last book without any aid whatsoever would not have been difficult.

What then are the points of difference between the style of the "Antiquities" and that of the B.J. ? They seem to consist mainly of a certain type of word peculiar to the B.J. Dr. Thackeray gives a list<sup>6</sup> including the following :- ἀδιάλειπτος, ἄπινος, δεκαδύειν, διέχεν (= διέχεν elsewhere), ἑκάστος, ἐξαινύης (rather like ἐξαινύης), ὀρεωδύν (and compounds), κοῦρην, λαθραίος, λεωφόρος, μεσημβριεὺς, μεγαλειόπρεος, μόνον οὐκ (= μικροῦ [δύν] elsewhere), ὁλόθυρος, ᾠωνόδρομῶν, ᾠονόρυχος, ἀράστημα, ἀρὸς δὲ (= καὶ ἐρρεῖ elsewhere), ἁποσιόθι, ἀναφεία, διὰ πάχους, κατὰ πάχος, χθαμαλός, χρισμός. Many of these words are semi-poetical or rare e.g.

ἀράστημα is found in Diodorus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus :

ᾠωνόδρομῶν in Diodorus, Plutarch, and the Vita Homeri.

To these may be added poetical words in the B.J., χερμαῖς, φρεσβλαβία, ἀδύρτος, σκέτομαι, μελιότομαι, δέλεια, ἑκυρά, κηλὶς, σμήχων, ἀφειδῶν, βῶλος, ἀναιμωπή, πρεβινθος, ἐπαιεῖς, σταχυμός, πῶμα (= corpse), κληδῶν, ῥυστόν, μετάρχιος, ἄρκυς (καὶ ἡ plural), σπιδεός, πύφωμα, ἡρόρειος, δυσάτος.

Thus the style of the B.J. is in part elaborate and rather ornate, being coloured with poetical words. Thackeray calls this particular style "Atticistic" : such a style came into vogue in the first century A.D., as a reaction from the pedantic, artificial style

<sup>6</sup> Lexicon Introduction, Part I, p. viii, almost identical with the list given in *Josephus*, Vol. III, p. xiv.

which had developed from the Alexandrian age, and was, in comparison, simple, aiming ideally at the Attic Greek written in the fifth century B.C. It thus demanded more careful choice of words and phrases than some of the first century A.D. writers made at the time when Hellenistic Greek was becoming diffused over the whole Roman Empire. So that from this point of view, as a literary composition, the B. J. has been called the most polished of Josephus' works. Generally speaking, it may be said that the style of the "Antiquities" is less Atticistic than that of the B.J., approximating rather to the ordinary κοινὴ, Hellenistic Greek of every-day speech.

In all this lies perhaps, a clue to the work of the "assistants". At the outset the difficulty may be noticed, not to say the impossibility on the present evidence, of identifying definite "assistants" for definite books. For, whatever the "assistants" did, the evidence of vocabulary in the B.J. strongly suggests that the B.J. is a unity : poetical and rare words, which Thackeray rather thought could be isolated into one book as the characteristic of one particular "assistant", modelling his style upon a poet, are found intermingled in the B.J. :-

- I. Words found in each of six books: - ἡρεμῶ, ἀρροσέχω (σπ. τοῦ νοῦν) ἀραστήριον.
- II. Words found in each of five books: - κρημνίον, δραστήριος, δυσωπῶ, ἀβοήγητος.
- III. Words found in each of four books: - ἀγανάκτησις, αὐτάνδρος, ἀλιπείριος, ὠρεαγία, θερμός (metaphorical), νύσσω ("stab"), ἠτάτομαι, σκέπτομαι (and compounds), χερμῆς.
- IV. Words found in each of three books: - ἰστορεῖν, δυσθυναῖν (-ῶ), ἐπικουφίζω, ὠπνέω, ἐκκοῤεαγία, κερατοκέω, (~~κατακτερεῖν~~), νεύματι (νεῦμα), μειλίσσεται (-ττ-), αἰθύνιος, ἀλιπυροῦν, φονικῶν, φρεσὶ βλάπτειν.
- V. Words found in each of two books: - ἀκαταπίπτος, ἀγέρτος, φιλοφυχεῖν, φημῶ, διωρῆς, αἰθαρχέω, ἀρρανέχω, νάπτος, ὑποκούπτω, εὐθυγία, δέλεαρ, θανυκτερεῖν, διαδρύσιος, ἀρεμάνιος, σφιδρός, ἀσπιδά, ἀναρροσίζω, ἀραγνεύω, χερροκοῦν, δολιχοῦς, ἀπολάνδριον, λυτῶν, ἀναιμωπῆ, γείσιον, νήφω, ἠτῶμα (= corpse).

Thus there is an inherent connection which exists between the books



of the B.J.: for the words instanced are not the common words which could be found in any prose author.

It can be inferred that the first draft of what was ultimately to become the B.J. was in Aramaic, because, Josephus says, in the preface,<sup>7</sup> "I have proposed to translate those books into the Greek tongue, which I formerly composed in the language of our own country, and sent to the Upper Barbarians". "Translated" - μεταβάλειν - is no doubt used in a general sense, and does not necessarily imply a faithful word for word reproduction of the original. In spite of the lack of definite evidence, it is very improbable that the "assistants" whom Josephus employed knew Aramaic: if they had known it, they would probably have been Jews like Josephus, and, in that case, we should have expected Josephus to say so in the "Contra Apionem", which is one of the finest ancient apologies for Judaism. On the other hand, Josephus knew Aramaic and Greek in 75 A.D. That he knew Aramaic is indisputable: there has been debate on the amount of Greek he knew.<sup>8</sup> Thackeray<sup>9</sup> says in effect that Josephus' partial knowledge of Greek in 75 A.D. was insufficient to enable him to arrange and compose the Greek B.J., in the skilled and able way in which it has been done. But Josephus had visited Rome in 64 A.D.,<sup>10</sup> by which year, at the latest, he must have come into contact with the language. Even if we allow<sup>11</sup> for exaggeration, he must have been a youth of some ability: he was in the Roman camp from the fall of Jotapata, (66 A.D.) and even a privileged prisoner, as he was, could hardly have had an interpreter constantly: he does not say that he prophesied to Vespasian through an interpreter, or that Vespasian gave him orders through an interpreter to appeal to the besieged Jews to surrender. The assumption underlying Josephus' account of himself in the B.J. is that he was acquainted with Greek: this acquaintance must have ripened into a working knowledge of Greek for literary purposes at least by and by 75 A.D., 70 A.D.,<sup>12</sup> when he had been in Rome for the space of four years, it must have taken the place of his native Aramaic as the medium of social intercourse.

<sup>7</sup> B.J. I. 3 - Whiston.

<sup>8</sup> See note at end. <sup>9</sup> Josephus, *the Man and the Historian*, p. 104. <sup>10</sup> Vita 13-16.



Josephus' knowledge of Greek then is not inconsistent with the conclusion to which an examination of the evidence of the language in B.J. led, namely, that it is predominantly Josephan. The explanation of the exact work of the "assistants" must be this. Josephus, as he says, "translated" the Aramaic original into Greek, and we have characteristic personal references in, for example, B.J.III.393-408. But though many of his time would have been content with the Greek as he wrote it, Josephus was not: so he employed the "assistants" "for the sake of the Greek", to polish up what he considered to be his rough phrases. The "assistants" then appear to be responsible for such vivid touches as ἀγγέλλον (B.J. I. 552.), ... ὁπαικούρει, where Josephus may originally have had the much more simple ἀσφαλῆ ... ὁπαιν. The work of the "assistants" must have been to go over Josephus' completed translation of the Aramaic, and improve the diction where it seemed to them at fault. Whether their efforts brought about an improvement depends partly upon the view taken of the presence of highly-coloured, vivid, or poetical words in a narrative. It appears almost, at times, that the "assistants" inserted curious or rare words merely for the sake of insertion.

A typical phrase which may be assigned to the "assistants" is ἄρην with the genitive - ἄρην ἀνγκέστου ἁθούς I.121; II.320, 233; VI.123: ἄρην τῆς ὠχῆς II.131: ἄρην ἀνγκέστου συμφορῆς V.372. The usage is not found in the "Antiquities", and is not characteristic of Josephus' style. Similarly with εἰς ὄχλου εἶναι, of that which is hackneyed, in B.J.II.251: IV.496. More striking, however, is the evidence provided by the concessive use of καίτοι and καίτοι in the B.J. The examples are as follows:- καίτοι B.J.I.437, 581. III.137. IV.18.410. V.15. VI.24.385: καίτοι B.J.I.249.349.530.579.606. II.372.385.617. IV.25.317. V.446. VI.5.356.382. No instances of either occur in the last book. That the two words should be present in the same work is significant, but when they appear within a few lines of each other, the conclusion is strongly supported that here more than one hand can be seen at work, e.g. I.579. καίτοι : I.581. καίτοι :

IV.18. καὶ τε : 25. καὶ τε : VI.382. καὶ τε : 385. καὶ τε . καὶ τε 18  
 used in the same <sup>way</sup> ~~(sense)~~ in Ant.XIV.430.480., XVI.242., and in one  
 instance, Ant.XV.119. καὶ τε is used ~~(in the same way)~~ καὶ τε  
 then appears to be the word which Josephus himself wrote, which the  
 "assistants" changed into καὶ τε . It will be admitted that καὶ τε  
 ἐσταυρώσας ἐπέκειν (Ant.XV.119.) is a rare use in the "Antiquities":  
 Josephus' usual form is καὶ τε , which is also used, chiefly in  
 speeches, as a connecting particle, with an adversative sense -  
 "and yet" - e.g. Ant.XV.133. XVI.33.40. XVII.10. B.J.I.7.13. The  
 "assistants" were not thorough in their change of καὶ τε (Josephan)  
 into καὶ τε The use of καὶ τε fourteen times in the B.J.,  
 but not in Books IV. and VII., suggests that the "assistants" were  
 fond of this word too. Admittedly the word occurs in the "Antiquities"  
 e.g. Ant. XIV.410. XV.6 - but it is more rare, and there is not such  
 a strained use of it as occurs in B.J.III.408. Variations in  
 the forms ἑσθηνός and ἑσθμῶς give another clue to the work of the  
 "assistants". The normal form is ἑσθηνός B.J.II.119. Ant.XIII.171.172  
 311. XV.373. XVIII.18., and is characteristic of Josephus. For the  
 sake of variety, presumably, in their final polishing of the work, the  
 "assistants" used the form ἑσθμῶς (II.119) instead of ἑσθηνός  
 As with καὶ τε and καὶ τε, the presence of ἑσθμῶς and ἑσθηνός so  
 close together in the B.J.II.113 and 119 must point to two hands.  
 The form ἑσθμῶς in Ant.XVII.346. may be explained by saying that  
 Josephus was there using the B.J. as his source, (Ant.XVII.346. deals  
 with exactly the same event as B.J.II.113.), and introduced the form  
 ἑσθμῶς from the B.J. The occurrence of ἑσθμῶς in Ant.XV.371, so  
 close to ἑσθηνῶν (Ant.XV.373) is puzzling, but the Latin esseni (371)  
 may suggest that ἑσθηνός existed in some manuscripts: thus the  
 confusion here may be due rather to later editors, who had the B.J.  
 divergences in mind, than to Josephus himself. The occurrence of the  
 form ἀνιδίον in B.J.II.137 and ἀνιδίον in B.J.II.149 is  
 corroborative evidence of more than one hand. All this  
 confirms the inference that the "assistants" employed "for the sake



MS. draft

of the Greek", made alterations ~~(afterwards)~~ in the ~~(dictation)~~ of Josephus, purely for the sake of embellishment. Their work was in no sense a collaboration with Josephus for the composition of the Greek, and sometimes they did not entirely change the forms in all the examples of the use of a particular word - e.g. *κλίσι* - thus leaving traces of more than one hand.

A feature of the B.J. is the number of words found elsewhere chiefly in Plutarch only, and which probably come from imitation of him, e.g. B.J.I.444. *φλεγμονή* (fig.): I.464 *πυρέσι* : I.589. *μισό-τεχνος* : I.572. *διανυκτερεύω* (cf. B.J.V.299.308.) : II.56.434. *δακρυθήκη* : II.531. *δεκάζω* : III.9. *ἐκρίνίζω* : III.232. *ἰλυσσώμεναι* : IV.386. *ἰχυρπικός* : IV.424. (etc.) *εὐπυνώ* : IV.591. *σφαδίζω* : VI.86. (etc.) *ῥομφαί* : VI.170. *ἰδυσώμενος* : VI.232. *πυρπύκω* (Passive): VI.336. *ἀπὸ θάλαττος* : VII.79. *κραδύνεμεναι* : VII.80. *τυφώ* (Metaph.) : VII.210. *δρυμός* .

Of Plutarch, Suidas says that he was born "in the time of Caesar Trajan, and even before,"<sup>12</sup> and that he became a consular under Trajan. Notices in Plutarch's writings tell us more: a priest of Apollo at Delphi, he came to Rome, picking up a certain amount of Latin during his visits, and gave lectures on philosophical subjects under Domitian.<sup>12</sup> He was twice in Rome between 66 A.D. and 80 A.D., the period within which the B.J. was written. It is not therefore outside the bounds of probability that Josephus or the "assistants" heard some of his lectures, and tried to incorporate some of his characteristic words into the B.J.

A consideration of the B.J. then, gives only hints at the style of the "assistants", as far as can be discovered by contrast with the "Antiquities", and by inconsistencies in the B.J. itself. The result is negative in so far as it suggests that the evidence for certain particular books being taken over by a particular "assistant" is slight, and such an inference <sup>unlikely</sup> ~~impossible~~.<sup>13</sup> As regards the undoubted peculiarities of style in Ant.XVII-XIX (which Dr. Thackeray ascribes to the work of the "Thucydidean assistant") an attempted explanation has been put forward in the section on "The theory of a Thucydidean assistant who was responsible for Ant. XVII - XIX."

*ἡ μεταβολὴ δὲ αὐτῶν Τηκυδίδους τῆς πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀφίξης . ἡ ἀπὸ ἀπολαύσεως 15.*  
<sup>13</sup> As regards the undoubted peculiarities of style in Ant. XVII-XIX which Dr. Thackeray ascribed to the "Thucydidean assistant", an attempted explanation has been put forward in "On the theory of a Thucydidean assistant, who was responsible for Ant. XVII-XIX."

The main result which such a consideration may claim to achieve is to emphasize that, although "assistants" were employed in the B.J., yet the work is Josephus through and through in matter, because the characteristics of Josephus in the "Antiquities" are all to be found there.

A priori, there may be a tendency to suppose that Josephus' part in the composition of B.J. was small because he had on his own admission more than one "assistant" : but instead of thus magnifying the work of the "assistants" to the exclusion of Josephus, a consideration of the B.J. suggests, and affords important evidence for maintaining, that the opposite is in fact the case.

Note:-

The Dean of York  
(~~Canon H. N. Bate~~) ("A Guide to the Epistles of Saint Paul", page 21.)

says:-

"But up to A.D. 66, even in Jerusalem, and to a large extent throughout all classes of society in Palestine, Greek was freely spoken. The Rabbis spoke it themselves, and zealous though they were for the honour of Hebrew, the 'sacred language', they seem to have preferred Greek to the 'unlearned' Aramaic."

This may be regarded as an exaggeration, but is certainly nearer to the truth than the view so often held.



The Style of Ant. XVII - XIX. - an analysis.

TENSES.

(a) The use of the Pluperfect Tense +  $\delta\lambda'$  in the Apodosis of a Condition, instead of the usual Aorist Indicative +  $\delta\lambda'$ .

XVII.	184	καὶν ἐπείραχεν
XVII	275	ἐπείραχτο δ' $\delta\lambda'$
XVIII	181	καὶν ἐπείραχτο
XIX	15	ἐγχευόμεναι ( $\delta\lambda'$ omitted)
XIX	252	ἐγχευόμεναι δ' $\delta\lambda'$
XIX	263	καὶν ἐπείραχτο.

(b) The use of Perfect or Pluperfect Tenses where the Aorist would have been more idiomatically used in Classical Greek.

XVII.	XVIII.	XIX.
2 ἐγχευόμεσαν	1 ἀπείραχώς... ὀδυνώσθαι	9 ἐπείραχτο
43 ἐπείραχοντο	24 ἐπείραχον	11 γινόμενοι
88 γινόμενος	113 ἀπείραχώς	14 ἀπείραχώς
133 ἐπείραχτο	116 ὀδυνώσθαι	32 δεικνύμενος
136 ἐπείραχτο	139 ἐγχευόμεσαν cf. 130 γινόμενοι	55 γινόμενοι cf. 85 γινόμενοι
164 γινόμενοι (cf. 336 γινόμενος)	145 ἐπείραχτο	62 δεικνύμενος
167 ἐπείραχτο	146 ἀπείραχώς	68 ὀδυνώσθαι
167 ἐγχευόμεναι	169 ἐπείραχτο	77 ἀπείραχώς
181 ἀπείραχώς. γινόμενος	199 ὀδυνώσθαι	78 ἀπείραχώς
231 ἀπείραχτο	206 πένοντες. ἐπείραχώς	82 γινόμενοι
237 ἐπείραχτο	208 ὀδυνώσθαι	84 ὀδυνώσθαι
238 ἐπείραχτο	210 κατέλαβον	91 ἐπείραχτο
245 γινόμενοι (x. r. p. 257 γινόμενος)	211 ἀπείραχώς	115 γινόμενοι cf. 117.
305 ἀπείραχτο	232 ἀπείραχτο	117 ἀπείραχτο
329 ὀδυνώσθαι	233 ἀπείραχώς	123 ἀπείραχτο
333 ἐπείραχτο	242 ἐπείραχτο	127 πένοντες
338 ἐπείραχτο		
(etc.)	(etc.)	(etc.)

II. PARTICIPLES.

(a) Participles not adequately connected and subordinated, to lead up to the climax with the main verb.

69 κελεύσας ..... δοῦναι	43 μισήσας ..... ἀπείραχτο	21 πῶν... ἀπείραχτο
83 γινόμενος... ἀπείραχτο	64 ἔχων... δοῦναι	47 πένοντες... ἀπείραχτο
115 ἀπείραχτο... ἀπείραχτο	85 πένοντες... ἀπείραχτο	97 ἐπείραχτο... ἀπείραχτο
130 ἀπείραχτο... ἀπείραχτο	99 ἀπείραχτο... ἀπείραχτο	125 ἐπείραχτο... ἀπείραχτο
161 ἐπείραχτο... ἀπείραχτο	105 ἀπείραχτο... ἀπείραχτο	238 ἀπείραχτο... ἀπείραχτο

## XVII.

- 191 εἰδώς ... βασιλεύσας  
208 φέρων ... ἔχων  
284 λελυγμένους ... ὄρων ... φιλοθεῖς  
343 φέρων ... μετακλίνας

## XVIII.

- 153 καθεστῶτες, μέλλοντος, μαθόντες  
169 ἐπικλυμένους ... ἰσχυρῆς ... ἐρομένου  
195 δεθείς ... κλειθείς  
224 ἰσχυροῦς ... ἐπιδίους  
230 θεωρώς ... ὑποπονήσας  
236 λύων  
249 φιλοτιμηθέντος ... ὑπερβλήσθαι  
277 διακονοῦντος, ὑπαγαγών  
279 συγκλίνας ... καταστῆς  
343 γνωσμένης, ἀποδόντος, ἀνηλεγμένου, εἰσῶτα  
(etc.)

## XIX.

- 276 γεγονότα ... αἰγροπύδα ... }  
320 δεδυγμένον ... ἀπμάς }  
δεδωμένον

(b) Participles coming after the main verb, at the end of the sentence, giving the impression that the clause thus formed is "hanging". (Frequently the case with Genitive Absolutes.)

- |  |   |                                     |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| 155 πηλῶν διατριβόντων                 | 3 ἑστάντος ... Ἰωάννου                        | 10 φθάσαντος ... πελευγῆσαι         |
| 197 ὑπεκτεμένους ... ἀρκεμένους        | 39 ἐπιδουλής ... γνωσμένης                    | 61 ἀντημαίνοντος ... ἀίροντος       |
| 269 πηλῶν ... ὄρμημένων                | 41 μὴ ἀποσκευῆς ... μηχανηθείσης              | 74 φεθαμένου ... μεζόνως            |
| 292 οὐχ ὑπομείναντες ... κατακλιπόντες | 54 ἀρχιμαγιστρίας ... πύχης                   | 76 δυναμῶς ... ἀρκευόμενης          |
|  | 56 φέρων                                      | 118 λανθάνοντος ... ἀρετληρότος     |
|  | 85 ἡγουσῶς ... κομισμένου                     | 160 καθ' ἑαυτὰς ... τραπομένων      |
|  | 116 πνυμένους ... βαπτιστοῦ                   | 173 φιλοτιμηθέντων ... ἀνάντων      |
|  | 117 τῆς ψυχῆς ... ἀρεκκεκαθαρμένης            | 195 τῆς θυγατρὸς ἀρεττιμένης        |
|  | 119 τοῦ θεοῦ ... θέλοντος                     | 236 Ἀγρίων ... κελεύοντος           |
|  | 122 ἐορτῆς ... ὡςστηκυίας                     | 255 οὐτε δεχομένων ... οὐκ ἐφισώπων |
|  | 126 δυναμῶς πρὸς αὐτῷ                         | 266 ἀρεττιπόντος ... αὐθύος         |
|  | 130 δεδωκότος ... τοῦ ἀρκευόμενης }<br>ἀρετός | 344 ἀρχομένης ἡμέρας                |
|  | 160 δεδωκὼς ... ἔπιμον                        |                                     |
|  | 200 μακρῶς ... ἀρεττικότος                    |                                     |
|  | 225 διαδοχῆς γνωσμένης                        |                                     |

(etc.)

III. CONNECTIONS.

(a) Sentences in which there is no connecting particle.

- |                         |                           |                         |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 53 οὗ γνωσμένου         | 11 Ἰωάννης φιλοσοφία γρῆς | 27 ταῦτα χαίρειν        |
| 55 Κορίνθιος ἦν         | 29 τῶν ἀζύμων             | 87 τοῦτο Γάϊω           |
| 60 πρὶ Ἀντιόχῳ          | 34 οὗ αὐτῶς               | 90 θύρας ἔχει           |
| 64 ὑπὸ πύγων ὁ βασιλεὺς | 36 ἑμμοῦς ὄνομα αὐτῇ      | 145 οὗτος διαθείς       |
| 65 ταῦτ' εἰς εἰστάτην   | 40 φραγῆς, αἰδῶν          | 150 τοσούτ' ὑπερίπευσεν |
| 77 ταῦτ' εἰπὺς          | 66 Παυλίνα ἦν             | 159 οὗτος ἐπὶ           |



## XVII.

- 85 τούτους ἐν Κιλικίᾳ τοῖς γράμμασιν  
 87 πύτους ἀποθνήσκουσιν  
 98 ὡς ἀποθνήσκουσιν  
 124 ὡς ἀποθνήσκουσιν  
 208 πύτους Ἀρχελάου  
 277 οὕτως ἀποθνήσκουσιν  
 300 ἀφίκετο εἰς

## XVIII.

- 67 ταύτης ἐστὶ  
 71 τῶν ἱερῶν τισὶν  
 81 ἡ ἀνέχε  
 91 τῶν ἱερῶν πρὸς  
 104 εἰς πύτους  
 130 ἱερῶν τῶν μεγάλων  
 167 ἀφ' αὐτῶν  
 233 αὐτῶν ἐκείνων  
 284 αὐτῶν ἐκείνων  
 290 ποσὺν ἀνέχε  
 311 Νάμδα τῆς Βαβυλωνίας  
 341 τῶν Παρθίων τινί

## XIX.

- 165 ταῦτα διανοοῦνται  
 216 οὐκ ὡς  
 226 ταῦτα ἀφ' αὐτῶν  
 291 τοῦτο μου  
 296 διὰ τούτων  
 325 αὐτῶν ἀνεβόα  
 330 τοῖς ἀλλοεθνεσίν  
 342 αὐτῶν Ἀγρίων  
 348 αὐτῶν ἄλλα

(b) Sentences in which a particle is used, although it is not entirely adequate.

- 55 μὲν οὖν  
 136 ἀποθνήσκουσιν οὖν  
 139 καὶ ἀποθνήσκουσιν οὖν  
 178 οὖν οὖν  
 207 συνόδου τ'  
 206 εἰς μέγα τε  
 212 ἀναστάσις τ' ἡ  
 236 δευτέρου τε  
 244 τὰς γὰρ διὰ τῆς  
 271 οὖν οὖν  
 301 καὶ ἀποθνήσκουσιν οὖν  
 304 λόγου οὖν  
 313 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τε  
 328 εἰς τὸν οὖν  
 328 ἀποθνήσκουσιν θ'  
 334 θεασάμενος οὖν

- 7 ἀποθνήσκουσιν τ' ἀποθνήσκουσιν  
 13 ἀφ' αὐτῶν θ'  
 14 ἀποθνήσκουσιν τ'  
 23 ἀποθνήσκουσιν τ'  
 25 ἀποθνήσκουσιν τε  
 42 ἀφ' αὐτῶν οὖν  
 74 ἀφ' αὐτῶν οὖν  
 79 οὖν τε  
 149 ἐκείνου τε  
 183 οὖν οὖν  
 192 θεασάμενος οὖν  
 201 ἀποθνήσκουσιν τ'  
 204 ἀφ' αὐτῶν θ'  
 209 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τ'  
 241 ἐκείνου οὖν  
 246 ἀφ' αὐτῶν ἀποθνήσκουσιν θ'  
 247 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τ'  
 249 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τε  
 283 ἀφ' αὐτῶν οὖν  
 326 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τε

- 4 εἰς τε  
 8 ἐκείνου τε  
 10 ἀποθνήσκουσιν τ'  
 37 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τε  
 38 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τ' ἀποθνήσκουσιν  
 49 ἀφ' αὐτῶν θ'  
 57 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τ'  
 85 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τ'  
 86 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τε  
 121 οὖν οὖν  
 123 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τε  
 135 οὖν τε  
 210 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τε  
 224 ἀφ' αὐτῶν οὖν  
 246 ἀφ' αὐτῶν οὖν  
 260 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τε  
 261 οὖν τε ἀφ' αὐτῶν  
 274 ἀφ' αὐτῶν τ'  
 311 εἰς οὖν τὸ ἀφ' αὐτῶν  
 319 οὖν οὖν

## XVII.

## XVIII.

## XIX.

(c) Sentences in which there is an adequate connecting particle, though it is put late.

236 ἐφ' οἷς δὲ	17 εἰς ὀλίγους τ'	160 τῷ στρατηγῷ δέ
259 ἐν τούτῳ δέ	20 τὰ χρέματα τε	255 τῇ συγκλήτῳ δ'
	34 καὶ τοῦτον δέ	293 εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα δ' ἐλθὼν
	92 καὶ σ' θ' οὖν	298 σὺν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς σὺν
	98 καὶ ἡ τ' Ἀρμενία	348 μετὰ σατυρῆς σὺν
	270 ἀπὸ μίθου δέ	364 ἀρὸ πάντων δ' ἐκτετακτε
	273 ἐν τοσούτοις δ'	
	286 ὁ Περώνιος δέ	
	362 συνάγει δ' οὖν	
	371 καὶ (καὶ) τὸ τ' οὖν	

IV. NEGATIVE PARTICLES.

Use of the negative μή where οὐ would be expected, and vice versa; also καὶ μή for μηδέ etc.

110 καὶ οὐ	21 καὶ οὐτε	25 καὶ μηδέν
123 καὶ μήτε	30 μή ... νομίζοντες	35 καὶ μή
147 καὶ μηδὲ μόθῳ	37 μηδέ ... ἐλεοθέρας	35 καὶ μηδὲν ἐνδοῦσαν ἡγῶ
156 καὶ μηδέν	57 καὶ μή	51 μή ἀνελκυσμένον
172 καὶ μηδ'	77 μηδὲν μοι μέγιστον	54 μηδὲν μελλήσας
277 διὰ τὸ βασιλεὺς οἰκίσαι } οὐκ εἶναι }	112 μηδὲν ... ἀροσδοκῶν	64 καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο
281...μή ἀποσπερμένῳ	162 μηδὲν ὕψιόν	73 καὶ μή
298 οὐ μηδέν	219 ἄκων τε καὶ μή βουλομένης	84 μηδὲν ὑπερβαλλομένης
342 μή φέροντες	231 μηδὲν ἐνδοιάσας	124 καὶ μηδὲν αἰδομένων
	244 καὶ μήτε	166 καὶ μηδέν
	269 καὶ μή	249 καὶ μή
	288 καὶ μηδέν	259 μηδὲν ἰδιωτῶν διαφέροντες
	331 οὐ διαμέπειν	
	369 καὶ μή δεξιόχειρος	
	372 καὶ μήτε	

V. ATTIC FORMS.

The Attic 'ττ'.

(Throughout, Niese generally prefers the 'σσ' form, Naber the 'ττ' form.)

In Ant. XVII. there are 60 examples.

For every one of these, except λύσσης 121, Naber has 'ττ'.

Niese has 'σσ' in every case, except ᾠράτταν 4; ἑώρατε 141, συνέωρατε 155, συνέωρατον 227.



## XVII.

## XVIII.

## XIX.

In Ant. XVIII. there are 63 examples.

Naber reads 'ττ' except in the following cases:- ἡσπύων 43, γλωσση 228.

Niese reads 'σσ' except in the following cases:- ἡσπύωντες 3, ἡσπύων 26, ἡσπύωντες 94, κρείττον 118, κρείττωνων 215, ἀλλόττε 237, ἐλάττω 295; (On 52 ἀρεφολύσσει, and 350 κρείσσονος, Niese says *Itel* MWE and MW respectively read : while on 215 κρείττωνων, he says MW have κρείσσωνων .)

In Ant. XIX. there are 61 examples.

Naber reads 'ττ' except in the following cases:- θαλάσσης 1, ἐπιθαλάσσιον 5, ἡσπύων 120, φυλάσσειν 285, φυλάσσειν 288, φυλάσσειν 290, 304. (δδ 285, 288, 290, 304, contain decrees.)

Niese reads 'σσ' except in the following cases:- κρείττωνων 211 (σσ'- MWExc.) κρείττον 248, ἐλάττω 291, κρείττον 293, ἡττον 302, ἡσπύωντες 325, κρείττων 326, ἀρεφολύσσει 326, ἡσπύωντες 334, κρείττων 345, ἐπιθάλπει 347, τέρπει 351. (On the last ten examples given here, Niese has no critical note.)

VI. Use of ABSTRACT nouns, where a more CONCRETE mode of expression may have been used.

(a) Characteristic use of ἐνί + Dative of an Abstract noun, often expressing purpose.

38, 285. ἐνί δέθρῳ	4, 302. ἐνί ἀποστάσει... ἐνί ἀνελύξει.	3 ἐφ' ἀφαιρέσει
58, 157. ἐνί πηγῇ	5 ἐνί συμμάχῳ	10 ἐνί ἀπολογίᾳ
62 ἐνί ἀποστασύν	12 ἐνί ἀνελύξει	13 ἐνί ἀκροάσει
63 ἐνί ἀράσει	19 ἐνί γυναικί	14 ἐνί ἀμύνῃ
68 ἐνί κακίᾳ	22 ἐνί ἀσχύσει σίτου καὶ βρωμῆς.	27 ἐνί καταστροφῇ
72 ἐνί ἐφάνισμῳ	55 ἐνί κακίᾳ	42 ἐνί σωτηρίᾳ
80 ἐνί κακίᾳ... ἐνί σφαιρῇ	70 ἐφ' ἀλύσει	60 ἐνί ἐξοργισμῷ
87 ἐνί πηγῇ	88 ἐνί ἀποστάσει... ἐνί ἀσχύσει	68 ἐνί τήρᾳ
126 ἐνί ἀνελύξει	117 ἐνί ἀφαιρέσει : ἐφ' ἀγνείᾳ	86 ἐνί ἀποκαταστάσει βίας
132 ἐνί θανάτῳ	136 ἐνί συγχύσει	90 ἐνί ἀναστροφῇ
138 ἐνί ὀνύχῃ	145 ἐνί τῇ βουθεσίᾳ	116 ἐνί φυλακῇ
145 ἐνί κακίᾳ	225 ἐνί δολίᾳ	130 ἐνί θρασυείᾳ
186 ἐφ' οἷς ἦσαν Ἀντιμάχου 241	ἐνί μνηστειᾳ	173 ἐνί κακίᾳ
194 ἐνί πείρῃ καὶ ἡσπύωντες 242	ἐνί μεταστροφῇ	199 ἐνί ἀπογνώσει
205 ἐνί ἀράσει... ἐνί ἡσπύωντες 263	ἐνί ἀφαιρέσει	205 ἐνί ἀφαιρέσει
206 ἐνί κακίᾳ	275 ἐνί ἀναστάσει	242 ἐνί σωτηρίᾳ

## XVII.

- 208 ἐπὶ ἀφισκομένη  
210 ἐπὶ σωφρονισμῷ καὶ ἀποτροπῇ  
214 ἐπὶ θρησκείᾳ  
220 ἐπὶ κηρίῳ  
221 ἐπὶ φυλάκῃ  
224 ἐπὶ ἀντιπαύσει  
229 ἐπὶ ἀφσκαλῇ  
252 ἐπὶ αὐτῇ  
253 ἐπὶ ἀποστράσει  
253 ἐπὶ ἐρώσει  
268 ἐπὶ ἀποτροπῇ  
303 ἐπὶ συνηγορίᾳ  
304 ἐπὶ καταλύσει  
308 ἐπὶ ἐξαρτάσει  
332 ἐπὶ τῇ κρίσει

## XVIII.

- 285 ἐπὶ ἀπογνώσει  
291 ἐπὶ ἀφισκομένη  
294 ἐπὶ πρὸς λύσει  
304, 340 ἐπὶ ἀφισκομένη  
349 ἐπὶ ἀπώλει  
353 ἐπὶ ἀποσλήσει

## XIX.

- 268 ἐπὶ ἀποτροπῇ

## (b) Other examples of Abstract modes of expression.

- 59 καὶ μετακλήσεως... μὴ γενόμενης 7 ἀσκήμων... ἐκπαλαιῶν ἀποστρέψαι } 1 τῆς ὑβριδος τὴν μανίαν  
80 τῆς κλήσεως... γιγνομένης 38 κατασκευῆς στήσεων γῆς ἐκδοσει 3 ἀπώσεως καὶ μεταναστάσεως  
86 διὰ τὴν ἐκκένου ἀποσπᾶν 42 συμῶσαι τῆς μητρός 35 εἰς τὴν ὄψιν τοῦ Γαίου  
94 ἀκροάσεως γενόμενης 55 εἰκόνων ἀπὸ τῆς 49 δειμῶν κινδύνων  
123 μετέθει πόλεως 77 μετὰ τὴν ἀρᾶν 59 μετὰ ἐκείνων καὶ ἐκείνης  
145 βοηθεῖα τῶν φίλων 79 μετῴσεως γενόμενης ἐξείλετο } 119 ἡ αἰσθησις ἐγένετο τῆς Γαίου  
151 ἐκ εἰκόνων ἀναστάσεως ἐκπορεύει 82 ἡ αἰσθησις ἐκείνη } 130 θεωρίας τε καὶ μονομαχιῶν  
159 ὑπαγορεύσει καὶ διδασκῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ 97 μεγάλων δόσεως χρημάτων 151 μετῴσεως σαφούς γενόμενης  
172 δόξαν μεταστάσεως 102 ζεύξεως τοῦ ποταμοῦ γενόμενης 203 ἐκτελέσει κολλάσεως  
183 ἐξουσία τῆς ἐπὶ τῇ αἰδοίᾳ πτωχείας 104 τῶν ὁμήρων τῆς λύσεως 212 ἀπορρηξέως... τῶν... ὁδῶν  
188 μεταβολῆς... γενόμενης 107 ἰδρύσεως τοῦ θρόνου γενόμενης 231 ἐκτελέσει τοῦ νομοῦ  
190 χρημάτων τε δόσεως καὶ ἀποσπᾶν } 115 τὴν Ἀρεῖα ἐκτελέσει 250 διαμετρεῖ μὲν... φόβῳ δεῖ  
199 κτενέει τῇ αὐτοῦ } 147 ὁλεθρῶ θῶν εἶχε χρημάτων 295 ἡ τῆς ἀλύσεως ἀνάθεσις  
206 νεωτέρων ἐκδομῶν ἀρχαίων 161 ἀποσπᾶν τὴν αὐτοῦ δηλῶν 302 ἐκτελέσει ἀπεβίαν τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων  
207 κολλᾶσει 169 ἐπὶ ἀσφαλείᾳ τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτοῦ 317 ἐκτελέσει τὴν ἀναστάσεως }  
218 φόβῳ κακοῦ μείζονος 175 εἰς τὴν διαφυγὴν κακοῦ 327 ἀποσπᾶν τῆς τῶν τειχῶν }  
223 ἡν ἀποσπᾶν τῆς αὐτοῦ 178 τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς ἀκροάσεως 329 δόσει χρημάτων }  
232 μεταστάσεως... ἀρκαθίον... διαλύσεως 197 τὸ ἀφνίδιον τῆς μεταβολῆς 341 δίχα μετακλήσεως  
233 αὐθούς... ἀμελείας 199 τὴν ἀποσπᾶν τῶν θεῶν 357 ἀρχιμονίστρας διηγήσεως  
263 ἐκτελέσει κακοῦ τοῦ ἀπειροπαθείας 207 ἐκτελέσει προῦτος καὶ δεξιότητι } 366 τοῦ ποταμοῦ σπέρματα }  
τοῦ ὁμήρων } βαλόντες }



## XVII.

- 279 ἀρβύλα...τῆς καθάρως τῆς }  
 292 τὴν ὄφιν τῆς ἀροσίου }  
 296 ἐφύσσε κερῶν  
 306 μὴ κατὰ φύσιν τε καὶ ἀντιστοίχῃ  
 324 ὁμοιοῦσι πρὸς φύσιν  
 331 μετὰ τὴν ἀντιστοίχῃ...ἐκ φύσιν

## XVIII.

- 234 τὴν τοῦ ἀρβύλου τῆς ὑπεμονίας  
 269 τὴν ἀντίθεσιν τοῦ ἀνδριάντος  
 271 ἀνδριάντος ἀντίθεσιν  
 274 ἀδυναμία καθάρως τῶν φύων  
 284 ἀρσούον...σύλληψιν  
 301 τῆς ἀντιστοίχῃ τοῦ ἀνδριάντος  
 314 βραδυπῆτα...τῆς ἀρίστως  
 329 δεινῶν δοσῶν  
 342 ἀκοὴν τῆς εὐαρεστίας  
 354 τῶν κωμῶν τὴν ἀλῶσιν  
 371 ἀπὸ τῆς ἐντυπώσεως τῶν νόμων  
 377 πύστις...ἡν...ἀποχώρησις  
 379 ὁχυρότητι τῶν σῶλων κώμῃσι τὴν ἀσφαλείαν

## XIX.

## VII. Characteristic words and phrases, found elsewhere in Ant.

- |              |                                |                            |
|--------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 9 ἀρονσίε    | 197 τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἀρόνσιαν      | 38 ἀρονσίε καὶ αὐτοῖς      |
| 181 ἀρόνσιαν | 289 ἀρόνσιαν ἔχων              | 39 ἀρονσίε τοῦ ἀσφαλοῦς    |
| 190 ἀρονσίε  | 309 τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἀρόνσιαν      | 72 ἀρονσίε                 |
|              |                                | 106 ἀρονσίε τοῦ λαοῦ       |
|              | 146 ἀντιθέσιν                  | 178 ἀρονσίε                |
|              | 336 ἐκ φύσιν                   | 219 ἀρόνσιαν τῆς σκουμένης |
|              | (cf. Vitā 149, 151, 231, 298.) | 230 τὴν ἀρόνσιαν           |
|              |                                | 285 ἀρόνσιαν ὅπως μετὰ...  |
|              |                                | 312 ἀρονσίε                |
|              |                                | 320 ἀντιθέσιν              |

## VIII. Examples of οὐκ ἀντιθέσιν and similar phrases. (Meiosis.)

- |                   |                   |                             |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| 17 οὐκ ἀντιθέσιν  | 68 οὐκ ἀντιθέσιν  | 5 οὐδὲν ἀντιθέσιν           |
| 32 οὐκ ἀντιθέσιν  | 85 οὐκ ἀντιθέσιν  | 30 οὐκ ἀντιθέσιν            |
| 34 μὴ ἀντιθέσιν   | 171 ἀντιθέσιν     | 38 οὐκ ἐκ φύσιν             |
| 36 οὐκ ἀντιθέσιν  | 180 ἀντιθέσιν     | 51 μὴ ἀντιθέσιν             |
| 38 οὐκ ἀντιθέσιν  | 331 οὐκ ἀντιθέσιν | 58 μὴ ἀντιθέσιν             |
| 39 μὴ ἀντιθέσιν   | 371 ἀντιθέσιν     | 107 ἀντιθέσιν               |
| 81 ἀντιθέσιν      | 200 ἀντιθέσιν     | 155 ὡς εἶσθαι τὰς ἀντιθέσιν |
| 160 οὐκ ἀντιθέσιν | 218 ἀντιθέσιν     | 184 ἀντιθέσιν               |
| 164 οὐκ ἀντιθέσιν | 283 οὐκ ἀντιθέσιν | 217 μὴ ἀντιθέσιν            |
| 171 μὴ ἀντιθέσιν  | 315 οὐκ ἐκ φύσιν  | 228 ἀντιθέσιν               |
| 239 μὴ ἀντιθέσιν  |                   | 243 ἀντιθέσιν               |

## XVII.

- 281 μὴ ἀποστελεσμένῳ  
304 οὐκ ἀνέλασμένον  
314 ἀνέλασθαι  
327 οὐκ ἀνέλαστο  
353 ἀνέλασεν

## XVIII.

## XIX.

IX. Characteristic use of τό with Neuter Singular Participle, in Present or Future Tense, and analogous usages.

- |  |   |                                       |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1 δὲ τὸ ... μὴ ἔτι κοινωγόνον            | 7 τῷ ὀρθουμένῳ τῶν κοινῶν   | 19 τὸ χρωμένον                        |
| 50 τὸ εἰς τὸν συνισμένον                 | 9 τοῦ ἀποσπένοντος  | 52 τῷ εἰς τὴν ἐκτασμένῳ               |
| 102 τοῦ συναποσπένοντος                  | 10 τῷ στυγερῶντι  | 54 τὸ ἀποσπένον                       |
| 159 τὸ ἐφομιλῶν αὐτοῦ                    | 60 τοῦ ἀποσπένοντος   | 72 τοῦ ... ἀποσπένοντος               |
| 201 (τὸ ἀποσπένον)                       | 66 τῷ ἐκτασμένῳ   | 77 τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς συγχερῶν ἀποσπένοντος |
| 210 τοῦ ἀποσπένοντος                     | 70 τὸ ... ἀποσπένοντος  | 78 τὸ ἔτι μέλλον                      |
| 228 τὸ μέλλον                            | 71 εἰς τὸ ἀποσπένον   | 136 τὸ ἐκτασμένον                     |
| 240 τὸ ὑπερῶν ... τὸ ἀναγκάζοντι         | 122 τῆς γυναικὸς ... τὸ ἀποσπένοντος  | 144 τὸ συναποσπένοντος                |
| 241, 243 ... τοῦ ὑπερῶντος               | 144 τὸ θέλον  | 146 ... τοῦ ἀποσπένοντος              |
| 252 τοῦ μὴ οὐ στασιάζοντος               | 145 τὸ μὴ μέλλειν τῶν δικῶν ἀποσπένοντος  | 150 τοῦ ἀποσπένοντος                  |
| 267 τοῦ ἀποσπένοντος                     | 147 τὸ μὴ μέλλειν τῶν δικῶν ἀποσπένοντος  | 150 τὸ συναποσπένοντος                |
| 268 τὸ ἀποσπένοντος                      | 158 τὸ μὴ μέλλειν τῶν δικῶν ἀποσπένοντος  | 157 τοῦ ἀποσπένοντος                  |
| 277 τὸ στασιάζοντος                      | 176 τοῦ ἀποσπένοντος  | 159 τὸ ἔτι λαύθον                     |
| 278 τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ εἰς τὴν ἀποσπένοντος    | 201 τὸ ἀποσπένοντος   | 176 τὸ ... ἀποσπένοντος               |
| 329 τὸ εἰς τὴν ἀποσπένοντος              | 211 τὸ ἀποσπένοντος   | 192 τὸ εἰς τὴν γυναικὶ ἀποσπένοντος   |
| 336 τοῦ ... ἀποσπένοντος                 | 211 τὸ ἀποσπένοντος   | 217 τὸ ἀποσπένοντος                   |
| 353 ἀνέλασεν δεῖν αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀποσπένοντος | 221 (τὸ ἀποσπένον)  | 319 τὸ ἀποσπένον                      |
|  | 225 τὸ ἐκτασμένον   |                                       |
|  | 236 δεῖν ... ἀποσπένοντος   |                                       |
|  | 239 τὸ μὴ ... ἀποσπένοντος  |                                       |
|  | 246 τὸ ἀποσπένοντος   |                                       |
|  | 267 τὸ ἀποσπένοντος ... τὸ φιλοῦν   |                                       |
|  | 280 τὸ ἀποσπένοντος μὴ ἀποσπένοντος   |                                       |
|  | 281 τὸ μὴ ... ἀποσπένοντος  |                                       |
|  | 295 τοῦ ἀποσπένοντος τῶν ἐκτασμένων (cf. Dion. Hal. 3.6.4. οὐδὲν ἦν τὸ κωλύον : cf. ἀποσπένοντος τοῦ κωλύοντος τὸ ἀποσπένοντος III.11.8. τὸ δὲ στασιάζον ἡμῶν.) |                                       |
|  | 333 τὸ εἰς τὴν ἀποσπένοντος   |                                       |
|  | 348 τὸ ἀποσπένοντος   |                                       |
|  | 349 τὸ ἀποσπένοντος   |                                       |



## XVII.

## XVIII.

## XIX.

## K. A characteristic phrase. (Pleonasm.)

23 ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

58 ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

25 μηδὲν εἰς ἀναβολὰς

107 οὐδὲν εἰς ἀναβολὰς ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ  
ὀρέως }

34 μηδὲν εἰς ἀναβολὰς ἀλλ' ὡς

170 ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

47 ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

171 ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

48 μηδὲν εἰς ἀναβολὰς

173 ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

107 ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

186 οὐδὲν εἰς ἀναβολὰς

197 μηδὲν εἰς ἀναβολὰς ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ  
ὀρέως }

236 ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

~~241~~

277 ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

279 οὐδὲν εἰς ἀναβολὰς ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

294 ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

299 μετὰ τοῦ ὀρέως

309 οὐδὲν εἰς ἀναβολὰς ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

317 ἐκ τοῦ ὀρέως

## XI. Use of ἀπεισθαι + abstract noun as equivalent to the corresponding

61 ζήτησιν ἀπεισθαι

65 μνήμην ἀπησάμενος

6 πτωχίας ἀπεισθαι <sup>verb</sup> τῷ ὀδῶν

76 διάφρασιν ἀπισμῆν

86 τὴν ἀνάβασιν ἀπησάμενος

12 κατηγορίας ἀπεισθαι

81 τὴν ἀνάθεσιν ἀπισμῆν

95 ἀπειτᾷ τὴν ὁδόν

31 (ἀπειτᾷν ἐπιστῶντο αὐτόν)

192 ἀπειτᾷ διάφρασιν

95 ἀπειτᾷ τὴν στολήν

70 ἀναβολὴν ἐπειτᾷ

202 φειδῶ ἀπεισθαι

107 διάφραν ἐπειτᾷ

76 τὴν ἐπιχείρησιν ἀπησάσθαι

223 ἐπιπλὰς ἐπιστῶντο

123 διατριβὴν ἀπειτᾷ

98 ἀπεισθαι τὴν ἔξοδον

251 ἐπίσχεσιν ἀπησάμενος

155 γυνῆν ἐπειτᾷ

115 ἀπησάμενος τὴν ζήτησιν

251 τὴν ἀναβυσσὴν ἐπειτᾷ

161 (ἐφῆσιν γενέσθαι)

153 ἀπλὴν ἐφῆσιν ἀπισμῆν

263 διάφρασιν ἐπιστῶντο

163 δάνεισμα ἀπησάμενος

155 ἀπεισθαι τὰς ἀπαιτήσεις τοῦ βίου

271 ἐνδορμήν ἀπειτᾷ

164 (διακλῆσιν γενέσθαι)

160 κατηγορίας ἀπισμῆν

340 ἐπαγγελίαν ἀπισμῆν

200 ἀν' ἀπιστίᾳ τὴν πελευχὴν

166 ἀπειτᾷ ἀρμίνην

341 ἀράβασιν ἀπησάμενος

211 ἀρόστραγμα ἀπησάμενος

233 πρὸς ἀγῶνας ἀπισμῆν

351 κατὰ μέμψιν ἀπεισθαι

218 κατὰ μέμψιν ἀπισμῆν

285 ἀπησάσθαι κρόνον

353 ἡθῶν ἀπησάμενος

229 σύνεσιν ἀπησάμενος

236 ταφὰς ἀπειτᾷ

268 ἀράβασιν ἀπισμῆν

319 ἀπεισθαι τὴν ἐπιπλῶσιν

320 ἐπαγγελίαν ἀπισμῆν

344 θρησκείαν ἐπειτᾷ

349 ἐπιστροφὴν ἀπεισθαι

## XVII.

## XVIII.

## XIX.

## XII. Use of ἄροκοκτω

- 6 ἄρούκοατεν  
142 ἄροκούειε  
181 ἄρούκοατε  
256 (ἄρουχώρει) = ἄρούκοατε  
289 ἄρούκοατε  
317 ἄρούκοατε  
339 ἄρούκοατε  
340 ἄρούκοααν

(cf. Ant. XX. 214. ἄροκοκτούων.  
Vita. 8. ἄρούκοατον. )

## XIII. Use of κουφίζω, and derivatives.

- 177 κούφισιν ψηφίσασθαι 178 κούφισιν γινώσθαι 25 ἐπικουφίζειν  
206 ὡς κούφισιν φέρουτα 149 κουφίζοι  
242 ἐπικουφίζεσθαι

## XIV. ἀπογνώσις = ἀπογνώσις . Dion. Hal. I. 8. 1: III. 5. 2: IX. 12. 5.

- c.g. Ant. XIII. 161. μετ' ἀπογνώσεως  
Ant. XVIII. 285. ἐκ' ἀπογνώσει ποιεῖν  
Ant. XIX. 199. ἐν ἀπογνώσει τοῦ ζῆν γεγονότας  
Ant. XIX. 248. ἐν ἀπογνώσει τοῦ ἐλευθεροῦ γεγονότας

## XV. Constructio ad sensum. cf. Ant. XX. 110, 111, 106.

- 276 τό τε καὶ ὁμοῦ... ἀπογνώσις οὐκ ἐστὶν 60 ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν ἀπογνώσιν 132 } τοῖς μὲν... τοῖς δὲ...  
330 ἐν τῇ ἰουδαίᾳ ἀγέῃ, ὡς ἀπογνώσιν 133 } συλλέγοντες 133 } σιγήν ἀρεδίδδοτο - ἡ - χαρὰ,  
σὺ μὲν... σὺ δὲ...

## XVI. μεταμέμφας (for μεταμέμφμενος .)

- 161 ἐβλέμεν (Naber), μετέμεπεν (Niese-P.)  
171 μετέμεπτον  
143 μετέμεπας  
175 καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον Ἀλεξάνδρῳ μετέμεπας  
223 μετέμεπας δὲ τοὺς  
φρουρήσαντες } 149 μετέμεπτοντες  
237 μετέμεπμενος

(cf. Vita 363. μετέμεπονται  
τὸν Ἰωάννην .)

(cf. L & S. M. 6. μετέμεπτον - "Thuc. seems to use the Act. and Med. indifferently; cf. I. 112 μετέμεποντος ; IV. 30 μετέμεπτον : VI. 52 μετέμεπτον : II. 29 μετέμεπτον : V. 82 μετέμεποντο : VII. 42. 3 μετέμεπτον .)

## XVII. μεθίστημι = "dispatch".

- 61 μεταστάσεως 147 τοῦ μεταστήγοντος εὐτόν 110 μεθίστησιν  
172 μεταστάσεως 209 τὴν μεταστάσιν 195 τοῖς μεταστάσιν  
(cf. Eur. Supp. 558 :- μεταστάσις) 236 τὴν μεταστάσιν 62 τὴν ἰδίαν μεταστάσιν  
τοῦ βίου 352 μεθιστά  
(Vita. 423. τῆς ἐκ τοῦ βίου μεταστάσεως .)



Ant. XVII. 74. (cf. XVIII.275. ἐπικλασθέντα .) ἐπικλασθέν τε τῇ  
 θανάτῳ is reminiscent of Thuc. IV.37, ἐπικλασθέν τῇ γνώμῃ : III.59.  
 ἐπικλασθέναι τῇ γνώμῃ : III.67. ἐπικλασθέντε (absolute.)

Ant. XVII.156. δοξὴ μᾶλλον ἀμαθεῖ ἢ ἀροντιᾷ ἀσφαλεῖ seems  
 reminiscent of Thuc. IV.108.4. τὸ δὲ πλεον βουλῆσαι κρίνοντες ἀσφαλεῖ  
 ἢ ἀροντιᾷ ἀσφαλεῖ.

Ant. XVII.215. τοῦ μανιώδους cf. Eur. Bacc. 299., Thuc. IV.39. καὶ τοῦ  
 κλέωνος κῆκε μανιώδης οὖσα ἢ ὑπόσχεσις ἀέβη

Ant. XVII.216. βροτὴ καὶ διακελευσμῷ κρώμενοι seems like  
 Thuc. IV.11.3. ἀροθυμίᾳ τε ἀδῶν κρώμενοι καὶ ἀπακελευσμῷ  
 (ἀπακελευσμός occurs in Ant. XIX.110.)

The absence of the Thucydidean  $\xi$  for  $\sigma$ , and of  $\epsilon\varsigma$  for  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  is  
 noticeable in Ant. XVII - XIX.

Ant. XX.

Vita.

(Numbers of sections as given in Naber's edition.)

I. PARTICIPLES.

(a). Participles in the same sentence, with change of tense for no grammatical reason.

- |         |   |     |                                      |
|---------|---|-----|--------------------------------------|
| 1       | χαρίζομενος..... ἀφίωθεις   | 115 | ἀναλαμβάνων... ἐπαγομέωσι... δειώσας |
| 18      | συγκαθώδων..... ἀροστανάπυρας                                     | 163 | ἐμβαλὼν συνέπαγομενον                |
| 36 & 37 | ἀφικόμενος, θεασάμενος... ἡγουμένως                               | 201 | ἐπαγομέωσι... λαβόντες               |
| 43      | ἀφικόμενος... δοκῶν... νομίζων                                    | 210 | θεασάμενος... ἀροθυμύμενος           |
| 48      | κατασχών, ἐνδεικνύς   | 249 | ὑπολαμβάνοντες... καταβάντες         |
| 54      | αἰσθόμενος... πύχθων... βουλομενος                                | 265 | συνορῶν, ἀνακηδήσας                  |
| 115     | λαβὼν... ἀροκομήσας... ἐπιβλασφημῶν... κατακροτομῶν... καθυλακτῶν |     |                                      |
| 215     | βουλόμενος... ἀροαγαγών   |     |                                      |

(b). Participles not adequately connected and subordinated, to lead up to the climax with the main verb.

- |     |  |      |  |
|-----|--|------|--|
| 62  | αἰθῶν... ἀροτύνων                      | 11   | νομίσας, αὐθόμενος τινα  |
| 115 | λαβὼν... ἀροκομήσας... ἐπιβλασφημῶν    | 16   | γνωρίθεις... ἀρακαλέσας  |
| 117 | δείσας... ἀλεκίφας                     | 65   | κατασκευασθέντα... ἔχοντα                                      |
| 125 | ἀροστηκότα... τυγχάνοντα, ἀραγνώσμενοι | *90  | ἀναλαμβάνων... ἀροτρυφας                                       |
| 130 | ἀραγνώμενος... καθίσας... διακούσας    | *96  | οδηγηθεὶς... λαβόμενος... ἐπιβὰς... διαφυγών                   |
| 165 | ἔχοντες, συναναμηνύμενοι               | 109  | ἰδὼν... φεβγθεὶς   |
| 174 | ἀκούσαντες... λαβόντες                 | *136 | εἰπὼν, ἐπιβοήσαντος, ἀναλαμβάνων                               |
| 184 | ἀρακαλέσας... αἰδῶς                    | 137  | ἀποστεινόμενος... ἀραμύντας, ἰδὼν                              |
| 206 | συνανατρεφόμενοι... ἀρωσόμενοι         | 142  | καταλιπόντες... γνωσόμενοι                                     |
| 215 | βουλόμενος... ἀροαγαγών                | 145  | δείσαντες... ἀναλαμβάνοντες                                    |
| 240 | διαφθαρέντα... κατασχόντα              | 146  | ἀροστάξας... ἀναβὰς  |
|     |  | *172 | βουληθεὶς... φωνήσας   |
|     |  | 181  | δεξιόμενος... ἐπιγυούς   |
|     |  | 223  | ἀροστάξας... ἀναστύβας   |
|     |  | 248  | ἀροαισθόμενος... καταλύσας                                     |
|     |  | 276  | ὑπονοήσας... καταλιπὼν   |
|     |  | 273  | γνωσόμενοι... αἰδῶντες... δείσαντες... ἰδὼν... ἀραμύντας       |
|     |  | 304  | ἀροαθῶν... δείσας... αἰσθῶν... λαβόμενος... ἐπιβὰς... διαφυγών |
|     |  | 374  | αὐθόμενος, ἀναλαμβάνων   |
|     |  | 401  | εἰκάσας... ἀροαθῶν   |
|     |  | 405  | αὐθόμενος... γινύσκων... ἰδὼν... γνωσόμενος                    |



## Ant. XX.

## Vita.

(c). Participles coming after the main verb at the end of the sentence, giving the impression that the clause thus formed is "hanging". (Frequently Genitive Absolutes are thus put at the end.)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 21 λυσιπυμένων ... ἀροτριμῶν           | 8 μνήμῃ τε καὶ συνέσῃ δοκῶν διαφέρειν         |
| 28 ἀροκρεθέντι ... δέναντων            | 9 συνιόντων ... γυνῶναι                       |
| 33 ὕπεκστάντα                          | 24 ἀπλῶν ... ἀπένων                           |
| 35 κατὰ πλάγιν ὠακούσας δέχσιν         | 30 διαρῶσαι κεκλικοῦν αὐτὴν... ἀροτρίναιαν    |
| 50 ἀροτριμούντος ἐπὶ πλάγιν τοῦ αἰδούς | 49 καταστάντων ... βασιλέων                   |
| 65 ἀφελῶν τῆς εἰσότητος                | 50 ἀφικομένου τοῦ Φιλίππου                    |
| 72 τοῦ Θεοῦ ... ὑπετερόντος            | 107 σκηψάμενος ... ἐπιβουλήν                  |
| 80 τὸν Ἀβιάδην... ζῶντα                | 120 τὴν Ἰβηρίαν λεηλατῆσθαι                   |
| 83 δυσκύντε ...                        | 142 δαδανωμένων ... αὐτῶν                     |
| 123 ἀποχωρήσαντας εἰς τὰ αὐτῶν         | 181 πρὶν βυρυτὸν οὖντας                       |
| 138 δυναστεύσαντα ... πέτταρα          | 196 μηδενὸς ... γινώσκουσας                   |
| 193 κειθρεθέντος ... ἑαυτοῦ            | 231 μετακτίσθαι αὐτοὺς βοιώντων               |
| 197 φήσας ... αὐθόμηνος                | 239 ἑαυτοῦ... αὐτομολήσαντος... ἀναμνησθέντος |
| 204 τοὺς ... διαφθείρας                | 243 πῶν... ἀφόντων                            |
| 214 ἀροκοιτόνων ... χεῖρον             | 252 ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς ὀρεγνάντων ... χάριν           |
| 232 ἤδη βασιλευσμένων Ἰουδαίων         | 256 ἐλεγχούων ... γεγραμμένων                 |
|  | 261 δόντων ... πῶν κομίζόντων                 |
|  | 289 ἐμοῦ... ἀντιστρατηγῶντος                  |
|  | 347 καταφρονήσαντες ἐμοῦ ... οὐκ οὐκ          |
|  | 353 κατὰ... ἀποσκοπούμενου ... Ῥωμαίων        |

## II. CONNECTIONS.

(a). Sentences in which there is no connecting particle.

- |                        |                              |               |
|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| 3 ταῦτα αὐθόμηνον      | 3 ὁ ἀρσενικός                | οὗτος ἐγένετο |
| 18 Μονοβάζος ὁ         | 4 τύπων εἰς                  | οὗτος ἡγάγετο |
| 27 οἷς ἀφικομένης      | 5 τύπου γίνεσθαι             |               |
| 30 πρὸς αὐτῇ           | 25 οἱ δὲ αἰεὶ                |               |
| 46 ταῦτ' ἀκούσας       | 40 ταῦτα λέγων               |               |
| 60 ταῦτ' εἰπὼν         | 43 Ἰωάννης ὁ                 |               |
| 89 ταῦτα τοῦ ἀγαθέου   | 46 Φιλίππου ὁ                |               |
| 118 ἔθνος ἦν           | 112 κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν   |               |
| 148 ταύτης αἰγίης      | 113 τοῦτους ἀπεικονίσθη      |               |
| 174 ταῦτ' ἀκούσαντες   | *126 νεανίσκοι πνεῦς θρασεῖς |               |
| 179 φάρεα αἰς οὗτος ἦν | *128 ταῦτ' ἐγὼ               |               |

## Ant. XX.

- 181 οὗτος ἐκράτει  
184 οὕτω πῶ ἔθνευ  
193 οὐκ οὐδὲ  
195 ἢ τοῖς μὲν δείκω  
214 εἴ' ἐκείνου  
228 ἐκ οὐτῶν  
249 μετὰ οὐτῶν  
265 οὐκ οὐτο

## Vita.

- 178 ταῦτα ἀπεί  
180 φίλωντος αὐτόμενος  
188 ἔς τούτους  
217 ἡμῶς ὑπὸ  
225 ταῦτ' ἀκούσας  
226 ἐρρωμένους ὑμῶς  
228 ταῦτα γράψας  
236 ταῦτα δὲ γράμματι  
238 ταῦτα συμβουλευσάντος  
242 ταῦτα τοῖς ἀγαθομένους  
251 οὐτῶν ἀναγερθέντων  
259 ταῦτ' ἐπὶ λέγοντός μου  
260 μετὰ οὐτο δύο  
268 τούτους οὕτως  
273 οὐκ ἀπεί  
286 ταῦτ' ἀκούσαντες  
287 ἀπὸς ταῦτ' ἐγώ  
299 ταῦτ' ἐκείνους  
346 τῶν ἐν  
377 ταῦτ' ἐγώ  
383 οὐτόν κομίσαντα  
391 λαβόντος ἀρχὴν  
427 μετὰ ταῦτ' ἡγεγμένην

(b). Sentences in which a particle is used, although this connecting particle is not entirely adequate.

- |                        |                     |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 4 λαβὼν σὺν            | 11 ἀκλεγεγνησας σὺν |
| 5 ἐκαστέρῃ τε          | 17 καταστάντων σὺν  |
| 16 εἴ' ἐκείνου τε      | 20 δεισας σὺν       |
| 19 ταχέως αὖν          | 28 νικηθέντος αὖν   |
| 21 φθόνος δι'          | 30 λαβὼν σὺν        |
| 24 μεταμετρήμενος σὺν  | 33 οὐτος δι'        |
| 26 διεγρίβω σὺν        | 37 ἀφελθὼν σὺν      |
| 29 βούλεσθαι ἵ' ἔφασαν | 47 ἐκτρέφους σὺν    |
| 57 βλέψων σὺν          | 48 αὐρεσὺ δι'       |
| 62 γράψαι τε           | 50 λαβὼν σὺν        |
| 69 οὐτος δι'           | 55 καλέσας σὺν      |
| 85 ταῦτα τε            | 57 ὑμῶν τε σὺν      |

## Ant. XX.

126	ἦκον σὺν
180	εἴκοστος τ' αὐτῶν
191	τόχον σὺν
206	καθ' ἡμέραν σὺν
212	μίστος σὺν
219	βλέπων σὺν
227	ἐγνώοντο σὺν
250	ἐπὶ σὺν

## Vita.

69	μεταμψόμενος σὺν	221	σὺντος δὲ
76	συγκληρόσαντος σὺν	221	γράφει δὲ
*90	ἐντυχὼν σὺν	240	σὺνκέει δὲ
*97	ἐρεῶσαντες σὺν	246	κρύψαντες σὺν
*98	δηήματα δὲ	251	κατέβαινον σὺν
*98	ἀρεσκάτων τε	253	ἠροδοτόους σὺν
*99	ἦκον (cf. 207)	257	ἴν' σὺν
101	ἀρεσκάτων τε	258	ἀπὸ τούτων σὺν
111	ὁλοσυνήμωσιν δὲ	261	ἔπειτα τε
121	τοῦτον σὺν	284	ἐψηλθον σὺν
138	μετὰ σὺν	292	ὡς σὺν
*146	ἠροδοτόους σὺν	305	μεταμψόμενος ἰσώθης
*148	δεδόσαντες σὺν	312	ἀπὸς οὗτος δὲ
153	ἀρεσκάτων σὺν	316	δοξάντος σὺν
154	αὐτοῦ τε	325	ἀνὰ δὲ
*156	κατακλῶσας σὺν	364	ἴν' δὲ
*163	ἐβουλεύσμεν σὺν	369	ὅθεν ἦν
*163	ἀρεσκάτων δὲ	373	ἀπὸς δὲ
*166	εἰσαντες σὺν	376	ἐπιδραμόντες σὺν
187	τάς τε	386	σύνθετος σὺν
189	ἀποθεμένους σὺν	393	δεδότας σὺν
193	δεδόμενος σὺν	398	σὺντος σὺν
201	ἀποθέμενος σὺν	399	οἱ δὲ
205	ἰσώθης δὲ	404	μεταμψόμενος σὺν
207	ἦκον σὺν (cf. 99)	410	ἀρεσκάτων σὺν
212	ἰσώθης δὲ	426	καθ' οὗ δὲ καί τινος
218	βουλεύσασθαι δὲ	427	ἐκ τούτων δὲ

(c). Sentences in which there is an adequate connecting particle, although this is put late in the sentence, instead of, as usual, being second or third word in the sentence or clause.

134	οἱ ἀπὸ Κουμανῶν δέ
136	τῷ Κουμανῶ δὲ ψυχὴν ἐπέβηκε
140	καὶ Παριάνην δὲ ἐρέδωκεν
147	τῷ αὐτῷ δὲ κερῶ
159	καὶ τὸν Ἀγρίαν δέ
177	μὴ ἀποθέμενος δέ
190	ἐπὶ ὕψιστον δέ

7	ὁ ἀπὸ δέ
13	μετ' εἰκοστὸν δέ
31	τοὺς ἐν Τιβεριάδι δέ
34	τῇ γνώμῃ δ' οὐ
43	ἰσὶ ἀπὸ Τιστὰ δ' εἶχε
51	μὴ ὁλοσυνήμωσιν δέ
52	καὶ τοῦτον δέ



## Ant. XX.

- 211 κατὰ τοῦτον δέ  
 211 καὶ Βυρυπίστis δέ  
 212 καὶ τὴν ἀλάν δέ  
 222 ὁ βασιλεὺς δέ  
 240 καὶ τοῦτον δέ

## Vita.

- 73 μὴ αὐθιγῶν δέ  
 112 καὶ οὐκ καὶ χρῆματα δ' ἐκκρημόντες  
 120 οὐχ ἀπαύσαντος δ' ἐκνήν  
 122 τοῖς ἀσκήμοις δέ  
 \*164 καὶ αὐτὸς δέ  
 \*169 τῷ στρατηγῇ γὰρ δέ τῷ  
 177 τὸν Ἰούστον δέ  
 186 καὶ Ἰουστον δέ  
 193 μὴ μέλλειν δέ  
 200 καὶ τῶν ἀσκήμων δέ  
 206 οὐ κατανύσσους δέ  
 216 κατὰ τοῦτον δέ τὸν κερὸν  
 223 μετ' οὐ ἀπλὴν δ' ἔραν  
 233 κατὰ τὰ δέ  
 262 τοῖς ἀπὸ τὸν Ἰωνάθην δέ  
 263 τὸ ἀπὸ θος δέ  
 276 δεῖ ἀπὸ δέ  
 277 κατὰ τὴν ἐκπύσαν συν ἡμέραν  
 307 μετὰ τῆς ἐκνήνων γὰρ  
 309 μετ' οὐ ἀπλὴς δ' ἡμέρας  
 314 οὐ δεῖν γὰρ  
 316 τοῖς εἰσέροις δέ  
 317 τοῖς ἐνσέροις δέ : καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰωάννου δέ  
 320 μὴ καὶ ἀπλὴς δ' ἐγώ  
 326 τοῖς οὐκίτας δέ  
 344 καὶ εἰ μετὰ τοῦτα δέ ἀπλὴς σου  
 355 καὶ ἀπὸ θανῶν δέ  
 356 καὶ μετὰ τοῦτα δέ  
 369 οὐκ ἡρεσκόμην δ' ἐγώ  
 381 καὶ Τιβεριὰς δέ  
 388 τὸν ἀπὸ βασιλεὺς δέ ἀπλὴς  
 390 398. κατὰ τοῦτον δέ τὸν κερὸν  
 390 τὴν ἀπὸ δέ  
 396 μετ' οὐ ἀπλὴς δέ  
 407 μετ' οὐ ἀπλὴς δέ ἡρόν

III. TENSES.

(a). Use of Perfect and Pluperfect Tenses more than is usual in Classical Greek.

35	μετακκομίσθαι	30	κεκρικόινυν
52	κατακείσιναι	55	κατακείναι
95	κατακείναι	59	δεδεδοτο
113	ἐκείναι	65	ἐκείναι
121	ἦν ..... κατακκομίσθαι	67	γεγονόσιν
145	ἐγεγονόσιν	*94	κατακείναι
*149	ἐγεγονόσιν	*95	κατακείναι
154	συνελάσαν	*96	καὶ ἐπελάσαν ..., εἰ μὴ ... ἀφικόμεν cf. 262.
165	μεμνημένος	116	ἐκείναι
182	ἀν' ἐδεδώκει, εἰ μὴ ... συνεχώρησε	120	κατακείναι
190	ἐγεγονόσιν	121	κατακείναι
260	διαπεθείκασιν	*133	προσυνέβητο
		*158	διμνήκασιν
		180	ἀφίχθαι
		203	ἐγγράψαν
		221	κατακείναι
		230	κατακείναι
		234	διμνήκασιν
		243	κατακείναι
		250	προσυνέβητες
		254	κατακείναι
		260	κατακείναι
		262	καὶ ἐπελάσαν πύργον, εἰ μὴ ... cf. 96.
		271	ἐγγράψαι
		281	ἐπὶ ἐρωμῶσι
		297	δεδώκεναι κατακείναι
		296	γεγονόσιν
		319	κατακείναι ἐγνώκεναι
		327	κατακείναι
		335	ἐλάσαν
		336	γεγονώς
		337	συντεθείκοσι
		340	γεγονόσιν
		341	ἀνελήφαι

## Ant. XX.

## Vita.

- 343 cf. 96, 262: καὶ ἔδωκεν δὲ, εἰ μὴ ... ἐφύλα  
 345 γεγόναι  
 354 γεγυέναι  
 362 ἠρτίετο γέγεον  
 364 γεγέρθεν  
 365 ἡφιβώκειν  
 368 γεγονότος  
 369 ἐγένετο γέγονα  
 385 γεγέρθεν  
 386 γεγόναν  
 391 διέγνωκεσαν  
 392 ἐπιδύνθασαν  
 397 ἔθρυκας  
 406 κατὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκέναι  
 412 ἀνὰ γὰρ  
 419 ἐγκέκλυτο  
 424 ἠρτίετο

(b). Use of Imperfect (and other) Tenses in the main verb  
 (or infinitive) for no obvious grammatical reason.

- |                                      |                             |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 10 ἐφύλα... καὶ ἐκέλευεν             | 12 ὑπερεβόλον               |
| 119 ἀφίκοντο, καὶ ἠρτίετον           | 56 ἐκέλευε                  |
| 192 σίκοφορος θεὸς ἀντιμένειτο       | 104 ἀφικνύμεν               |
|                                      | 131 ἐκέλευον                |
|                                      | 137 ἡρτίετο γέγονας θυγάτην |
|                                      | 156 ἐκέλευον                |
|                                      | *167 ἐκέλευον               |
|                                      | *168 ἀνέλεον                |
|                                      | 193 ἠρτίετο                 |
|                                      | 194 συνεβούλευον            |
|                                      | 198 ἐκέλευον                |
|                                      | 219 ἠρτίετον                |
|                                      | 222 ἐθαύμαστον, ἠρτίετον    |
|                                      | 237 ἐκέλευε                 |
| 245 ἐφύλαχθαι... <del>ἠρτίετον</del> | 290 εἰσήγε... ἐκέλευεν      |
| 255 ἠρτίετον                         | 319 συνεβούλευον            |
| 263 ἀνέλεον                          | 328 ῥάπτουσι... ἐκέλευεν    |



IV. NEGATIVE PARTICLES.

Use of the negative μή where οὐ would be expected; also καὶ μή for μήδε.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 18 καὶ μή                              | 11 καὶ μήδε                                 |
| 78 μήδεν πολλύτας                      | 18 καὶ μή                                   |
| 139 μή βουληθεῖς                       | 42 πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ μή θελήσαντας             |
| 172 μή δύν... λέγοντες                 | 55 καὶ μή ἠστυώσας                          |
| 206 καὶ τοὺς μή διδόντας               | 56 μήδεν                                    |
| 252 καὶ ἀπονήτῃ μήδεν αὐτοῦ διαφύουσιν | 79 μήτε ἀροαεῖα ἀνθρώπων                    |
| 254 μήθ' ἀραγῆς... μήδενά τρώων μήτ'   | *86 μήδεν ὑποαυτῶσας                        |
|  | *93 ὡς μήδε... φυλακίδων                    |
|  | 185 τοὺς δὲ μή συναρροσκομένους... ἀνθρώπων |
|  | 193 καὶ μή                                  |
|  | 218 καὶ μή                                  |
|  | 227 καὶ μήδε                                |
|  | 252 μή συνθεύτες δ'                         |
|  | 261 μήδεν ἀρροκιδόντων                      |
|  | 276 καὶ μή μήδεν ὑπονοήσας                  |
|  | 285 καὶ μή                                  |
|  | 319 καὶ μήδεν                               |
|  | 320 μή καὶ ἀραγῆς δ' ἐγώ                    |
|  | 348 μή βουλόμενοι                           |
|  | 349 μήδεμῃς δὲ... ἀσπῆς... ἀρροκιδῆς        |
|  | 413 καὶ ὅσα μή... ἀνεγέγραφα                |
|  | 418 ἐγὼ δὲ... μήδεν ἔχω πρῶτον              |
|  | 419 καὶ οὐδὲ λῶτρα                          |

V. ATTIC FORMS.

The Attic 'TT'.

- |                              |                      |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 90 γλῶσσαν (καὶ γλῶτταν)     | 47 ἀρροκιδῶντων      |
| 130 τέτταρες                 | 55 ἀρροκιδῶντων      |
| 165 σφάττειν                 | 125 ἀρροκιδῶντωντες  |
| 180 συρροκιδῶντες ἐαρροκιδῶν | *128 φυλακῶντων      |
| 234 δεκατέττα                | 202 ἀντιτεττατοίμην  |
|                              | 203 ἀρροκιδῶντων     |
|                              | 207 ἀρροκιδῶντες     |
|                              | 209 ἀρροκιδῶντος     |
|                              | 215 καὶ ἀρροκιδῶντος |

223	τέτταρας
227	καταφυλάττω
235	τέτταρας
242	τέτταρας
278	πέτασιν
285	τέτταρας
287	τέτταρας
310	αροστέατον Θάττον
318	ἐφύλαττον
322	τέτταρας
334	αροστέατον (and 377.)
337	αρόττουσι
349	φυλάττειν
378	αροστέατοντος
393	κρύττον
414	ἐφυλάττομεν

VI. Use of ABSTRACT nouns where a more CONCRETE mode of expression may have been used.

5	φρονίδια καὶ ἀρουσίε	8	εἰς μεγάλην καὶ εὐαίετος ἀρουσέων ἐπίδοσιν (cf. Ant. xx. 160.)
7	φρόνη τοῦ ...	16	αὐτὸς τῇ ἐνέργειᾳ ταύτῃ
13	εὐσεβείαν καὶ σπουδὴν	21	μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀντιέσθιν Μαντήμου
29	μετ' ἀσφαλείας (cf. Vita 163.)	25	ἐπὶ ἰωμύων ἀποστάσει (cf. Ant. xx. 130.)
30	καὶ τῆς ἀντιέσθως τῶν ἀδελφῶν	45	ὅτι ἀσφαλείας (cf. Ant. xx. 31.)
31	ὅτι ἀσφαλείας (cf. Vita 45.)	67	μετὰ τὴν ἀπὸ Κόσμου ... ὁμιλίαν
32	μέχρι τῆς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἀρουσίας	71	εἰς ἐπιτοκίαν
41	χωρὶς τῆς ἀπειρομῆς	*87	τὴν ἀρετήν ... ἐδέξαντο
46	τὴν ἀρετήν	*90	ἀγαθὸν πὺν τὴν ἐμὴν ἀρουσίαν...σημαίνοντα
56	τῆς σῆς ἐπιτοκίας κρήνη	109	αὐθιγῶσι τὴν σύλληψιν
61	ταῖς καὶ τὰς ἐπιδόσεις ἀρετῶν κλέπτειν	116	τὸ ἀνευκτέον συνιδῶν
79	τὸ δῶμα	124	τὴν μὲν ἀποστάσιν οὐκ ἀποδέχοντο
89	ἐπὶ τὴν ἰσχυρὴν ἐργασίαν τοῦ θεοῦ	137	ἰδὼν τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῶν ἀρετῶν
94	τῇ τῆς λύτης ἀλγύμῃ	139	συνεὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀγέθους τὴν μεταβολὴν
99	καὶ τοῦ Κουρῶν φάσος τῆς ἐπιδόσεως χρόνους	149	ταῖς τῶν ἀρετῶν ἀπὸ χάρις αὐτῶν ἀθανάτησιν ἀεικλῶμενοι
103	τὴν διαδοχὴν τῆς πρῆς	*163	μετ' ἀσφαλείας (cf. Ant. xx. 29.)
130	ἐπὶ τῇ ἰωμύων ἀποστάσει (cf. Vita 25.)	177	μετὰ τὴν ἀναχώρησιν τοῦ Φιλίππου
145	μετὰ τὴν ἰσχυρὴν περὶ τὴν	193	δεξιότητος σὺν τὴν ἀρετήν
160	ἀπὸ τὴν ἐπίδοσιν ἐλάμβανεν (cf. Vita 8.)	231	οὐκ ἀρῶντες δ' αὐτοῦ ἀποκρίσεις

## Ant. XX.

- 203 μετ' ὧν  
 213 καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀφίξεως  
 217 καὶ τῆς ἀφίξεως σὺ διήμερον  
 222 τὴν καθίευσιν ... τὴν παρασκευὴν  
 228 μέχρι τῆς εἰς Ἰουδαίαν ἀφίξεως  
 229 ὥς τῆς τοῦ βίου τελευτῆς  
 243 μετὰ γὰρ τὸν θάνατον αὐτῆς  
 249 ἀπὸ τῆς καταστάσεως τῶν ἱερῶν  
 254 καθάπερ εἰς ἐνδεῖαν ἀπογῆς ἀφθίς  
 265 καὶ τῶν πόνων τὴν ἐπιχαρτίαν ὥθους ἔλαβον

## Vita.

- 246 ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀφίξεως  
 271 τῆς κατ' ἐμοῦ ἀφίξεως  
 272 εἰς κίνδυνον ἀπωλείας  
 273 ὥς ἤκουσαν τὴν ἐμὴν ἀφουσιάν  
 283 εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὸ ἐνθύμημα  
 283 σὺ ~~ἐφ' ὅ~~ ἀρροσύμῳ αὐτῶν τῆς ἀσφαλείας  
 293 εἰ γένοιτο ἀπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐπίθεσις  
 329 ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ σώματος θεραπείαν ἐγγνώστην  
 356 ἀγγέλας ... τῆς ὁφείας  
 358 μετ' ἀκριβείας  
 361 τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας παράδοσιν  
 364 τῇ τῆς ἀληθείας παραδόσει  
 403 θραύσεως δὲ τῶν ἀρθρῶν γενομένης  
 411 ἄχρι τῆς εἰς Ἰαλικιανὴν ὁδοποσίαν ἀφίξεως  
 414 μετὰ αὐτῆς ἐπιμελείας  
 417 ἐκ τῆς καταγραφῆς τῆς ἀπείδος  
 423 μέχρι τῆς ἐκ τοῦ βίου μεταστάσεως

VII. PLEONASTIC use of verbs, pronouns, and nouns.

- 98 τὸν Θεὸν ζωηρόντες ἀποτέμνουσι τὴν }  
 104 τελευτῇ τὸν βίον κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ }  
 108 τὸν αὐτοῦς ὑφίσταται ... ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεὸν }  
 154 ὡς ἀβύσσος αὐτοῦς εἶναι καταχυνώσεως }  
 188 αὐτῷ  
 242 τελευτῇ τὸν βίον  
 252 Κλαζομένιος δὲ τὴν τὸ γένος οὐτοῦ

- 42 τότε δὲ αἰσῶς Ἰούστως  
 60 ὑπομνηστικῶν, διηγουμένως  
 \*97 θέλει γὰρ ἐφασκόν  
 \*172 δεισάντος δὲ τοῦ κελευσθέντος  
 177 πλεονῶν αὐτῷ γραμμάτων κακουργίαν  
 185 ἐπειθεὶς αὐτοῦς  
 200 ἀπερχομένη αὐτοῖς  
 207 τοῦτο ἀρῶντες  
 237 ἔφη  
 242 διηγουμένη κελεύων  
 245 ἐφασκόν  
 274 ἐφασαν  
 275 ἐφασκόν  
 314 ἐφασαν



Ant. XX.

Vita.

## VIII. Use of Infinitive-noun (τό + Infinitive), and constructio ad sensum.

7 φόβος τοῦ μή ... ἀναγκασθῆναι	*173 ὥστε τοῦ μή ἀπολαβεῖν
106 κελῶν ... ἵσθιν ἀναλαβούσαν ... ἐστάναι	184 ἡρόνσαν ὥστε τοῦ μή ... γενέσθαι
110 κελῶν τὸ σιγᾶν καὶ <sup>κατασκευάζοντες</sup> ἀντὶς ἀνοικτῶν	204 καὶ τῷ τὸν πατέρα ... παρακαλεῖν [με]
111 τὸ πλῆθος ... θεωσάμενον ... καὶ φοβηθέν, <sup>ἀναλαβόντας</sup> νομίζοντες	204 ἡρὸ τοῦ τελευτῆσαι
	242 ὥστε τοῦ μηδένα ... συναναμειγνύσθαι
	266 ὥστε τοῦ μή ... ὀφείως φέρεσθαι
	269 ἡρονοήσασθαι τοῦ ἀσφαλῆ γενέσθαι τὴν <sup>πορείαν</sup> αὐτοῦ
	270 ὥστε τοῦ μή ἐξιδίως πρὸς μάθειν
	275 διὰ τὸ τὴν ἐπιστάν ἡμέραν εἶναι παββάτον
	284 τοῦ μὲν τὸν ἰσχυρόν εἰς ἀφροσύνην
	291 ὥστε τοῦ λαβεῖν δόκλον με

## IX. Characteristic words and phrases.

Passim. Θεοῦ ἡρωσύα

ἐρεθίζω (and compounds.) e.g. Vita 149, 151, 231, 298.

(The sections belonging to the old "Rechenschaftsbericht" are, according to Laqueur, as follows :-

Vita 85 - 99, 103, 126 - 129, 132 - 136, 145 - 148, 156, 158 - 174. )

(Examples which come from the "Rechenschaftsbericht" sections are marked with an asterisk; thus e.g. \*173.)

THE LATIN VERSION OF JOSEPHUS' WORKS; its nature and value.

(With particular reference to the MS. <sup>B.1.1.</sup> in the Cathedral Library, Durham - D - Ant. XVII-XX.)

If it had not been for the work of the early Christians, who sought out any mention or alleged mention of Jesus Christ, the writings of Josephus would never have been preserved. As it was, they possessed not only some reference to Christ, John the Baptist, and James, but the first part of the 'Antiquities' deals with the events in the Old Testament, and even used the Hebrew Scriptures among its sources. This being so, it is not to be wondered at that his works should have not only been read but also translated into Latin. If we can make the inference from the number of Latin manuscripts, which, Niese says, are too numerous to mention, Josephus must have been known in the West, mostly, if not solely, through the Latin translation.

There are two important references to its origin. Jerome <sup>I</sup>says "The rumour that has reached you that the books of Josephus and of St. Papias and St. Polycarp have been translated by me is false, for I have had neither the leisure nor the strength to render these writings with the same elegance into another tongue." From this it may be presumed that in the time of Jerome (ob. a.d. 420.) there was no Latin version, and that Jerome himself did not make one. Reference to this passage is found in Cassidorus, <sup>O 2</sup>who says "ut est Josephus paene secundus Livius in libris antiquitatum Judaicarum late diffusus, quem pater Hieronymus scribens ad Lucinum Baeticum propter magnitudinem <sup>T</sup>polixi operis a se perhibet non potuisse transferri: Hunc tamen ab amicis nostris quoniam est subtilis nimis et multiplex magno labore in libris viginti duobus fecimus in latinum, qui etiam alios septem libros captivitatis Judaicae mirabili nitore conscripsit, quorum translationem alii Hieronymo, alii Ambrosio, alii deputant Rufino. Quae dum talibus ascribitur, omnino dictionis eximiae merita declarantur, nam vita sola neque extat Latina, neque tunc versionem Latinam adepta esse videtur." ("22" = 20 Books of the 'Jewish Antiquities,' + 2 'Contra Apionem.')

Thus, we may say, either under his supervision, or by himself personally, a translation of the

Jerome Epist. 71 ad Lucinum C. 5. <sup>2</sup> 'De Institutione divinarum litterarum.' 17.

Antiquities and the Contra Apionem was made by Cassiodorus (ob. 575 A.D.): this is the one we now possess. The translation of the B.J., we learn incidentally, had also been completed, though it was ascribed variously to Jerome, Ambrose, and Rabinus. Besides the version of Cassiodorus, there is also extant a free version of the B.J., by a certain Egesippus or Hegesippus, entitled "De Bello Judaico et excidio urbis Hierosolymitanae": the seven books of the B.J. in Greek are compressed into five, additions were made from the Antiquities, and notices about Jesus, Peter and Paul occur. There is some doubt about the identity of the author; but the version is little followed.

The "Latin version", means, to all intents and purposes, the version made by Cassiodorus, either directly or indirectly. It was spread abroad far and wide, being copied and re-copied in the monasteries. It was originally made in the monastery of Vivarium, where Cassiodorus had retired (539 or 540) and gathered around him monks, who lived either at Vivarium or at Castellum, the second monastery, which he built. Cassiodorus was the first to realise that it was necessary, in view of the destructions by the Barbarians, to make copies of important works of literature, in order to preserve them. Besides this contribution to monasticism, he also wrote a number of books ~~esp.~~ "On the Soul", "On the Psalms". He died at a ripe old age, a monk who had once been Pretorian Prefect, a position which he resigned when he was about sixty years of age. His last work, on orthography was written in 573, at the age of ninety-three. His death is presumed about 575.<sup>3</sup> (~~Hodgkin. "Italy and her Invaders."~~  
~~IV. 341-352.~~) The first printed copy of the version was made at Augsburg in 1470.

(B.ii.i.)

In the Cathedral Library at Durham, is a typical manuscript, containing the Antiquities and the Jewish War. It is well written on large folio sheets, each side containing two columns, with fifty lines per column, as a rule. A certain amount of beautiful illuminating has been done on it, though it is not so elaborate as some.

<sup>3</sup> Hodgkin. "Italy and her Invaders." IV. 341-352



It seems as though some books are illuminated more fully than others, e.g. at the opening chapters (the system of chapters is different from that in Niese and Naber), but, at least, the first letter of each book is fine and ornate. The gatherings are in eights, each one being numbered. Although there are no signs of an ill-treatment of the manuscript, some passages indicate that a revision of the text was made. e.g. XVII. 19. after "procreatus", there is a marginal note "Erat autem filia coniuncta cum ea neptis altera." XVIII. 36. Over 'genesar', is written "stagnum", between the line. 37. Over multa, <sup>i</sup> i is inserted - multa. 63 - 65. There is a marginal note, in a much later hand, drawing attention to the passage. 125. ad petreos was the original reading: r has been removed, as the rough surface indicates, and e substituted: over t an abbreviation <sup>7</sup> has been put, indicating "ter". A line divides off 'eos' - <sup>3</sup> hence adpetere eos. 147. "in" is inserted over "ut", between the line. 260. 'filio' - the second i has a dot underneath it, signifying "delete": hence 'filo' (ὁ φίλων). 365. 'fere.' over the 'r', another 'r' is added between the line: thus ferre. XIX. 88. fuerunt: the first 'u' is crossed out, giving 'ferunt' (ἐστρέψαντες). XX. 69. bardini: the first i has a 'a' over it ~~e~~ 'bardani' (βαρδάνη). 85. 'pubula: the first 'u' is changed to 'a' - thus 'pabula'. 147. 'suspectumque.' Over "Spe", "cep" is inserted, i.e. susceptum = ὑποσχεσθαι. 197. placeret: an a is inserted over the first 'e'. The revision to which these examples testify was probably made at the same time as the manuscript was copied: they are frequently in the same ink, and the shape of the letters, and the abbreviations (where they occur) point to its being contemporaneous: in XVIII. 63 - 65 the note was added later, as the hand shows. XVIII. 125. has different ink, and was probably later. In the early books of the Antiquities, references to the Old Testament have been inserted later into the margin.

The manuscript is written in moderate sized letters, fairly closely joined together: it is thus comparatively easy to read. It seems to have been copied by a single scribe, to judge from the

uniformity of the letters, except for changes in thickness, owing, presumably, to a sharpening of quill. Rud's notice about the MS.

is:- pulcherrime scriptus est hic Codex, in folio magno lineis divisis, literis maioribus, rotundis, ante annos circa 600.

(i.e. C. 1250.) The date is confirmed by abbreviations.<sup>5</sup> They are chiefly these :-  $\Gamma$ ; (sed):q; (quod):  $\dot{d}$  (dicite):  $\omega$  (orum):  $\rho$  (post):  $\overset{\circ}{g}$  (ergo):  $\tilde{t}$  (tur):  $\check{q}$  (quasi):  $\check{q}$  (quod):  $\check{u}$  (um):  $\check{c}$  (con)+c.p.  $\check{c}$  = contra:  $\check{f}$  (fratrum):  $\check{s}$  (secundum):  $\check{p}$  (prae):  $\check{p}$  (per):  $\check{p}$  (pro):  $\check{g}$  (gens): cf.  $\check{d}$  (dicens):  $\check{e}$  (eum):  $\check{m}$  (mille):  $\check{u}$  (vel):  $\check{p}$  (prae) - occasionally.

The abbreviations are not always used, e.g. con is often written in full. According to Capelli, these indicate a date about the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. In a few places there are minor slips. XVII. 177. in eids in eids D. The words have thus been copied twice. This is signified by a line underneath the second "in eids" in D. XVIII. 111.  $\epsilon\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \rho\acute{o}\mu\eta\varsigma$  - romani (for romam.) XVIII. 326. ab his quibus eum ut perimere~~nt~~ fuerat delegatus (for delegatum.) XIX. 192. qua for quā (quam): 300. agrippa for agrippā (agrippam): 344. oculis (abbreviation  $\text{l}^{\text{r}}$  = lis, and full form as well): 358 ungentis for unguentis. XX. 41. opm for opum (operum): 161. clinei for  $\Delta\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota\tau\upsilon$  (dinei): 252. floriis for florus. Generally the copying is accurate and clear.

In his critical introduction, Niese observes that while there are occasionally divergences in the text of the Latin MSS. he consulted, they are by no means comparable with those between, for example E and P of the Greek MSS. Being copied frequently, errors were almost inevitable at times, due sometimes to a scribe faithfully copying the error he found, or wrongly restoring the text. There are, however, hardly any examples of widely different versions in the Latin MSS. - a fact proving a common source, and testifying to the general accuracy of copying. D. preserves a different reading from the MSS. which Niese quotes <sup>in</sup> on the following <sup>passages:-</sup> ~~occasions~~ -

<sup>4</sup> Catalogue of MSS. in the Cathedral Library, Durham, 1825. <sup>5</sup> cf. G. Capelli, 'Dictionario di Abbreviature', passim.



XVII. 21. D. rex amana, Niese. rexama: 268. eumque. {D}. quemque  
 Niese: 354. vera D. vero, Niese: XVIII. 179. in tiberium fluvium D:  
 in tiberim fluvium, Niese: XIX. 77. spectabat D: expectabat, Niese:  
 119. tacina D. tagma Niese: XX. 59. et vim similem habituram D;  
 et tui similiter habe curam, {Niese:}. 130. dortus D. doitus Niese:  
 143. berenicis D. berenicae Niese: 162. esse pius D. saepius Niese:  
 59. facta D. fata Niese: 69. bardini<sup>a</sup> D. partadani Niese:  
 100. salis D. psalis Niese: 114. tutos D. vicos Niese. 178. tuba  
 missa D. (τῆς βαλῆται)• turba missa Niese: 236. onias D: ananias  
 Niese - this entirely vindicates D: 204. multos D. plurimos Niese.  
 Most of these examples could have arisen through copyists' errors  
 except XX. 240. D - cum et pontificatum tenuisset et regnum is namque  
 primus usus est annuo diademate, heredem fratrem reliquit Alexandrum -  
 which is entirely different from Niese.

To what family of Greek MSS. then does the Latin version belong?  
 This can only be approximately inferred, because the division of the  
 Greek manuscripts into families is only itself an approximate one,  
 and not entirely exhaustive and mutually exclusive. The chief  
 Greek manuscripts which contain, often among other works of Josephus,  
 all or part of Ant. XI - XX., are as follows:<sup>6</sup>

1. Codex Ambrosianus. (A.) of the eleventh century. It contains  
 Ant. XI - XX., although some isolated passages are wanting:  
 an attempt was made by a fifteenth century hand to restore them.
2. Codex Mediceus (M): bibliothecae Laurentianae. of the fifteenth  
 century. It contains Ant. XII. to the end.
3. Codex Vaticanus (W) 1354 A.D. It contains Ant. XI - XX in full,  
 with an epitome of Ant. 1 - X.
4. Codex Regius. (R). Paris. of the fourteenth century. It contains  
 Ant. XI - XX in full.
5. Epitome. (E). Niese identifies nine manuscripts containing the  
 Epitome, all of which emanate from and are copies of an original  
 Epitome, the author of which is unknown. A "terminus ante quem"  
 for its date is fixed from the fact that Zonaras (Historicus et

<sup>6</sup>cf. the Introduction to the Critical Edition of Niese and Niese.



- Lexicographus, retired to Mt. Athos: floruit. circa 1118 A.D. <sup>7</sup> )  
 quoted the version. Perhaps the tenth century may be taken as  
 the date of its composition. E does not contain the Vita:  
 speeches are frequently omitted, and the evidence of other  
 historians, and Josephus' narrative, is often cut down.
6. Codex Palatinus. (P.) Vatican Library. of the ninth or tenth  
 century. Bks. XVIII. XIX. and XX are wanting, also some  
 isolated passages.
  7. Codex Laurentianus. (F.) of the fourteenth century. Ant. XVI-XX  
 are wanting in this manuscript.
  8. Codex Vaticanus (V.) of the fourteenth century. It contains  
 Ant. I - XV only, with the exception of Ant. XIII. 316 - 351.
  9. Codex Bibliothecae Leidensis. (L.) of the eleventh or twelfth  
 century. It contains Ant. XV - XIX.

Both Naber and Niese agree that these manuscripts may be divided  
 into two families. - PFV and AMW; with L intermediate, and E, on the  
 whole, agreeing with the AMW group. In Ant. XX A and E, separately,  
 have each individual additions, which are mostly in the nature of  
 synonymous phrases, - a characteristic which is not shared by other  
 manuscripts of the group. Naber frequently accepts these additions,  
 but Niese not so frequently.

Niese places implicit trust in P., perhaps because it is the  
 oldest manuscript we possess. <sup>8</sup> F. and V. only contain XI - XV, ~~of~~  
~~Ant. XI - XX.~~ Where P is wanting (in Ant. XVIII - XX), Niese  
 follows A. Such implicit faith in one manuscript is now generally  
 discredited, especially since the discovery of the papyri which  
 throw such light on this subject. Naber says that on Niese's  
 own admission, P "negligenter exaratus est et vitiis scatet," and  
 relies himself rather upon the AMW group, with especial regard for  
 A and E, separately.

<sup>7</sup> Riddell & Scott, 'List of Authors, with editions referred to,' v. s. Zonaras.

<sup>8</sup> The comparatively late date of all our Greek MSS. of Josephus is to be noticed, and  
 contrasted with that of the Latin version (6th century, A.D.)

It may be concluded that D belongs to the AMW (E) group.

There is only one important exception - Ant. XVIII. 315 ἀποσώμων <sup>rell.</sup> ~~hwē~~,  
λεγόμενον <sup>rell.</sup> vocatur D. At times the MSS. of the AMWE group

differ, so that examples occur (e.g. XVII. 134. 268) where D agrees with AM, or A, and not MWE (XVIII. 193), or with MWE and not A.

(XVIII. 218.) D does not follow one manuscript completely, as the examples in Ant. XX show: here A and E have some curious additions, mostly at the end of sentences, which do not contribute to the sense. The Latin does not read these explanatory clauses, which seem to be glosses added after the sixth century when the Latin version was made.

### AMWE group.

### AMWE group (continued).

- XVII. 134. οἰκείων Att. domesticis. 80 καὶ ὡς Att bene.  
268. τὸ μὲν ἀνύμωμον <sup>infideli</sup> καὶ 110 ἀποκατεργασμένος hw praestriatus  
282. τὰ γὰρ ἄλλοι Att exercitūs. 123 βάρβαρος hw barbarus  
348. ὡς δὲ λέγει οὗτος Att a cesare. 192 δὲ ὅς ἐστι flos.  
XVIII. 13. ἰσχυρὰ A iudicium 250. ἐναντία hwē contraria.  
19. οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐκασταὶ celebrant. 254. ἐπὶ τὸ μονομαχίῳ <sup>monomachia</sup>  
23. ἡ δὲ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν ἐκασταὶ huius sequaces 268. ἑτέροις A alios.  
23. Ἀννίου τοῦ τοῦ hw (E) annii rufi. 293. οὐδὲν ἐ, om. hw, om. D.  
51. ἔπειτα ὡς nulla illi <sup>temporibus regni necessitatibus</sup> } 317. αὐτοὺς καὶ κινδύνους ἐ. laboribus  
81. ἀμφότεροι hw transgressionē. 338. πάντας hw cunctos.  
95. Γαλιλῶν ἐ παριζαίων. 347. ~~ὡς~~ hwē ~~(iactant)~~ <sup>respicimus</sup>  
131. ἐπὶ τῷ οὐρανῷ <sup>occisus</sup> ~~delectatus~~ } 42. Ἰζατὴν hwē iazatim.  
192. αὐτὸν αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ δὲ ἡμεῖς } 23. ἀπομένως Att hwē libenter.  
- hanc dicunt - sed vicissitudinem } 40. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐ ἀδυνασέσκει.  
- i merita reddidit.  
218. διαφθεῖσθαι hwē discedere. 77. αὐτὸν ἐ. cum  
294. ἡλόντων ἐ praesentiam. 91. δακῶν Att dacus.  
346. καὶ ὅς κτενομένης hwē motus. 110. πάντας ἐ omnes.  
350. ἡνέχετο hwē ex. tolerabat. 130. δόρυς hw : ἐ δόρυς : dorcus.  
352. γνομένης hwē ex. soluta } 157. ἐναντίω <sup>tenet</sup> A.  
iudicia habens <sup>sententia</sup> } 204. ἀλλοῦς hwē. nullus.  
sub amore constrictum  
360. ἀποθυμήσας hwē festinaret. 218. ταῦτα om. Att, om. D.  
XIX. 51. φοβερὸν Att. formidini. 232. τριποκοσίων Att. <sup>trecentorum</sup> } 243. τῷ θεῷ ἐ dsi.  
71. ἀνθρώπων ἀλλήλων hw. dum }  
nullus sequitur delinere. }  
79. δι' αὐτὸν αὐτὸν <sup>saeculi</sup> }  
saeculi. }

D not supporting E. A. AE.

(XVIII. 228) καὶ δὲ ἀρχέλαος εὐαγγέλιος  
ἡρώδης ἐ. cesar suspirius  
ab archelao litteras.

XVIII. 156. Πέτρον ἐ. primum.

315. ἀποσώμων hwē vocaliter.

(XVIII. 6. καὶ τὴν κέλευσιν τοῦ  
λαοτοκράτορος add. E, om. D.  
4. τοῖς δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος λεγομένοις  
add. E, om. D.)

(53. 2. τοῖς ἰσχυροῖς ἀνέγκυς  
ἀνεκλήσαστο add. A, om. D.)

(58. καὶ ἀποσώμων add. A, om. D.)

(60. καὶ τὴν om. E, D. h. om. hw.)

74. μεγαλῶς add. E, om. D.

75. ἰζατὸν add. E only: om. D.

75. τὸν βασιλέα ἐ only: D iazaten.

(75. καὶ τὴν ἐνδοξάν αὐτῷ τῶν ἡθῶν  
χρηστότητα add. E, om. D.)

(75. καὶ τὴν ἐρεσιν εἰς ἀέρας  
ἐξήνγκαν add. E, om. D.)

76. οὐράτως διατθέντες add. E, om. D.

77. τόπως add. E, om. D.

79. τὸ δέμα add. A, om. D.

80. ἔπειτα εἰς χεῖρας συγκληθέντων  
τοῦ Ἰζατὸν add. A, om. D.

109. καὶ παρὰ add. A, om. D.

114. λόγον τῶν ἀποκαμένων  
ἐλαττωρότητας add. A, om. D.

(115. δὲ τῶν ἀποκαμένων  
στρατιῶν, add. E, om. D.)

115. ἀκρατῶς καὶ ἀκατῶν add. E, om. D.



D, not supporting E. A. AE (continued).

120. καὶ φόνους add. E, om. D.  
 180. καὶ ἔξαρσις σταύρας ἦν add. E, om. D.  
 180. καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸν συναγωγίως add. A, om. D.  
 180. ἔχθρα πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ διόδοις add. E, om. D.  
 194. ἀπὸ τοῦ Νέωντος add. E, om. D.  
 190. ὧντα add. E, om. D.  
 191. αὐτὸν νομίσμων add. AE, om. D.  
 234. περικύβητος E. quadrangulus (= cell.) D.  
 235. καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τῆς διόδοις ἀνελκυσαντες add. AE, om. D.  
 262. ἀνελκυσαντες καὶ add. E, om. D.

(Thus D only seems to follow A, and E, separately, where they have readings which are not in the nature of explanatory and synonymous additions.)

### The nature of the Translation.

Like every work, the Latin version has its characteristics. Of these may be noted the use of videor and the infinitive. This periphrastic use arose originally from Cicero, whose custom it was to end sentences, especially in his speeches, with - esse videatur (or some other form of videri.) So far was this from meaning "seems to be", (i.e. may possibly be.) that it was chiefly used for a strong affirmative statement - "definitely is." Writers of Latin, with Cicero as their model, fondly believed that their style was "as good as Cicero's", provided they ended their sentences with "esse videri", at once a periphrasis and a form of meiosis. The usage in D is shown by the following examples. (esse videri is not found invariably; sometimes esse dinosci occurs.): - Ant. XIX. 194. ἀντομυμένων videbantur iniuncta. 241. σφαλῶν vivere videntur in malis. 270. διαχειρίσασθαι, ipse videbatur occidisse. 277. τεταπεινωμένον, videbatur afflicta. 282. ὑποταχθῆναι noscitur subjugata. 286. ἦν γεγραμμένον esse dinoscitur (scriptum.) 354. γεγραμμένον videbatur esse coniuncta. 359. κατασκευασθαι probabatur fabricatus. XX. 15. ἀποσκευασθέντος videbatur esse commissum. 94. περιελώντων videbatur amisisse. 95. κατασκευάσθαι construxisse videbatur. 219. ἔτετέλειτο videretur esse perfectum. Cicero frequently has - esse (videor) at the end of the sentence: ~~this~~ this is not always followed in D, though a form is found in XIX. 286. esse dinoscitur.

By the time that Cassiodorus wrote, Latin had changed a great



deal from the classical style, to the "Ecclesiastical", with the Silver Age as the intermediate period. In the style which was thus evolved, a great deal more elasticity was allowed in the use of constructions and the composition of words and phrases. The following instances in D show the use of constructions which would have been wrong in classical Latin, yet not necessarily so in the sixth century. -(Ant. XVII. 176. ne quo suum arbitratum indeorum falli proposito - (~~which~~) seems entirely corrupt.) e.g. XIX. 13. sperans etiam ipsum ..... extinguere. XIX. 107. dum possent multae machinationes auxilium gaio conferri. 296. lapsu faciente (ὁλισθαίνων). 313. eum scilicet existimans dignior est. XX. 71. et credens eum per talia verba terrere (φοβύσων). XX. 261. me facere promisi.

Even in the Greek manuscripts it is difficult to find unanimity on proper names, and to discover what exactly is the correct form which Josephus wrote. It is generally useless to turn to the Latin version for a solution to these difficulties, because there is here the added difficulty that a further translation has taken place: thus a word, originally Hebrew in form is transliterated into the Greek, and the process is repeated in the Latin version once more, so that proper names are frequently corrupt. Added to this is the fact that there seems to have been a tendency at times in D to make Latin nouns or words out of proper names. (- the responsibility for this lies rather with a reviser or a scribe at some period in the manuscript's tradition, rather than with Cassiodorus.) The examples are many but a selection may be made of them:- Ant. XVII. 54. Σόφρον - sondum. 56. filargum, proper name formed from φύλαρχον - cf. 19. omonius (ὁμώνυμος). 175. Ἀλεβάν alexandrum. 188. Ἀντίπαν antipatrum (so too in 227, 229, 238, 318.) 275. ὁ γὰρ ἑταῖρος nam exercitus (= ὁ γὰρ στρατός). 350. Παριώμην mariam. XVIII. 26. ἐν Ἀκκίῳ acciaco. 44. Ἡρώδην Herodem. 52. Ἡρώδῃ Herodi. 103. Ἑλεάζαρον lazarus. 123. Θεοφίλῳ (cf. XIX. 297.) eo filio. 125. adpetere eos (ad petreos.) 135. Ἰωταπῶν iotapalam. 135. Ἰωταπῆ iotapa. 179. ἐκ τῶν κλισίων ex campo. 85. κείν' ἔδον -

caphedon nomine. 237. *Μάξιλλον* Maxillum. 275. *Γαίου* gaius tiberius.  
 XIX. 120. hispanis - this is valuable, for the Greek is corrupt - *ὁ  
 σάνιον*: 185. trebellius. Greek, erroneously *Στερέμιος*. 145. *ἑωχέστος*  
 gratus homo. 297. *Θεόφιλον* seophilum (cf. XVIII. 123.) 313. *Κανθεράν*  
 chanteram, contrast 297. *Κανθεράς* canthera. XX. 58. *Ἀρταβανόν*  
 artabanem. 66. *Ἀρταβανός* artabanus. - Contrast 54. *Ἀρταβανός* artabanum.  
 140. *Βερονίκη* beronice. 143. *Βερονίκης* berenicis. 190. *Ἀσαμωναίου*  
 asamonei - Naber, Niese, and Latin all agree here. 147. *Ἀγριππῶν*  
 agrippa.

Frequently, with numerals, the abbreviations which were used in  
 the manuscripts have caused confusion, so that as a rule they are the  
 most unsatisfactory feature of any author's work. Dr. Foakes-Jackson<sup>9</sup>  
 points out that this is particularly the case with Josephus. e.g. -  
 XVIII. 106. *ἐπὶ καὶ τριάκοντα* triginta et duos. XX. 14. *πσάων*  
 XIII - D. (Probably due to confusion of XIII. and IIII - X and I being  
 very much alike.) XX. 194. *δέκα* ducem (decem.) 232. *δεκά* XX (=twenty)  
 250. *εἴκοσι καὶ ὀκτώ* XXVIII (=twenty-nine.)

In a number of passages the translation is flagrantly wrong, where  
 it is very probable also that the original Greek of the Latin  
 version had the same reading as we now possess. These examples may  
 be divided into two sections, the first (A) composed of blunders which  
 may possibly have arisen in the tradition of the manuscript, and the  
 second (B) of blunders traceable to the original translation, and  
 perpetuated.

(A). XVII. 40. *εἰς δὲ τὸ θαρρεῖν* sed audiendum (audendum.)  
 180. *φιλοζωεῖν* ex more (ex amore). XVIII. 297. *ἀνάθεσιν*  
 ereptionem (erectionem.) 363. *παρωσι* audientibus (audentibus.)  
 XIX. 281. *ἐκδύματα* dictis (edictis.)

(B). XVII. 255. altera vero ad orientem loca posita detinebat. - before  
*μῆρα δ' αὐτῶν ἡ τρίτη* (255.). D thus not only has an equivalent  
 for *τῶν δ' αὐτῶν δύο μερῶν σ' μὲν εἶχον, μῆρα δ' αὐτῶν ἡ τρίτη*,  
 but adds the above, thus giving four divisions in fact, but saying there  
 ————— are three only. 272. *ἄγων καὶ φέρων* nam hue et

<sup>9</sup> 'Josephus and the Jews'. S.P.C.K. 1920.



illuc agebat et ducebat et ductabat exercitum. 277. πρὸς δ' ἀλλοφύλους -  
 γινέσθαι - et propterea alienigenae irruperant, per quos seditiose  
 (= ae) mentes occasionem accipientes ad bella concitanda succensae  
 sunt intentione sola devastandi et aliena rapiendi. XVIII. 105.  
 μετὰ λθόν reverteretur. 205. κρήζεν oportere. XIX. 2. ἀγούτος καὶ  
 φέρντος libenter tractaret. 287. Σεβαστός pius. (Augustus.)  
 352. τῶν ἀροσιόντων supplicantibus.

When compared with the Greek manuscripts we possess, it is  
 noticeable that at times D omits certain phrases (A) or sentences  
 which are contained in all existing Greek manuscripts, or merely  
 inserts a short paraphrase (B) which is just sufficient to keep up  
 the thread of the argument contained in fuller terms in the Greek.  
 The following instances are typical of many. A. Passages wanting  
 in D: - XVII. 68. καὶ πάλιν - συνήρω αὐτοῖς: 175. τὸ δ' ὀλοφύρμων -  
 λυγρὸν εἶναι: 181. ἐωθόρων ..... καταπύσθαι: 252. στρατιὰ περὶ τῇ  
 κατεκλειμμένη ..... καὶ τῇ ἀγύθει: 256. ἵα τὸ μὴ ..... ἀφθέντας αὐτοῖς:  
 282. ὃ σίτον ..... ἔφειρον: XVII. 291. ἀροικαφθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῶν σικητόρων:  
 335. ἀλλὰ ἀγίων ..... πρὸς ἐπιβεβουλευκότας: XVIII. 17. ἀράττεται ..... τοῖς  
 ἀγύθειν: 24. ἀραπέρω διελθεῖν ἀφελικόν ..... ὃ λόγος ἀφελήται:  
 100. καὶ νομίζων ..... πρὸς ἀροαφειστηκότας: 227. δέματι κακῶν ..... τῆς ἐλαττοῦς:  
 232. δερμῶν ..... χέρματος: 308. καὶ ἵσθη ..... κατέλαβε: 372. μὴτ' ἀνεκτὸν  
 ἡγούμενοι τὴν συνουσίαν: XIX. 10. ἐν ἀπολογίᾳ ..... τὴν ἐπιτολήν:  
 29. καὶ ὅσπερ ..... εἰς αὐτόν: 270. ἀποπνεύμενος ..... ἀπώμενος:  
 298. οὐκ οὐκ ἀπεί, καθὼς καὶ ἀρόπερον ἔσχον: 358. ἔν περ τῆς  
 δημοσίως κατεκλεισμένης πόλεως: XX. 26. διέτριβεν - end of 37,  
 (ἀνέστειλεν) - this omission is peculiar to D: 64. πύρρατο γὰρ -  
 ἀφελήσθαι: 218. μέγας δὲ πῦρ ..... ἀφελήσθαι: 240. γυμνός -  
 241, τὴν ἱερουδὴν δὲ κατασχόντα.

B. Passages in which D is merely a paraphrase. e.g. XVII. 274. τοῖς  
 συνουσιόσι ..... ἐπιτρέψων, D. cunctaque exterminio dabat ignibus  
 concremando. 285. ἔμμελως (Naber.AME.) ἀπείως (Niese.)  
 D - habitatio. 354. πῶς ἴ' ἀμφὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἀθανάσιος ἐμφερούς,  
 deinde ut exemplo vera putentur dicere illi quibus immortalitas



disputatur animarum. XVIII. 377.  $\dot{\iota}\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha$  (vlg. Niese.),  $\dot{\iota}\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\theta\epsilon\tau\alpha$   
 Hudson and Naber. D nulla tamen iam eis spes vivendi fuerat derelicta.  
 Nam etiam ibi omnes gentes iudeorum terrore premebatur. Nam tam  
 babilonios quam selentios formidolosos habebant.

There are cases on the other hand where D indicates clearly that  
 there is a lacuna or corruption in the Greek texts we possess, its  
 translation being such as to prove that it is hardly a free  
 paraphrase, and must rest on the authority of some Greek which cannot  
 now be retraced with any accuracy. e.g. XVII. 29.  $\dot{\iota}\lambda\gamma - \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ,  
 et reliquos rex efficiebat abunde muneribus - this version is not  
 only free, and probably from the same Greek original as we now have,  
 but also, possibly a mistranslation, e.g. a form of  $\delta\omega\epsilon\alpha$ ,  
 (muneribus) for  $\epsilon\delta\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\phi\omicron\epsilon\iota$ . Ant. XVII. 38. neque tunc quando  
 secretas machinationes construebant - this suggests a lacuna between  
 $\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\delta\acute{\iota}$  and  $\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\delta\epsilon$ . 69.  $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  iubens ut post eius abscessum cum  
 iam spatium aliquanti temporis cucurrisset, ubi ratio provocaret,  
 patri protinus propinaret. 212. After  $\delta\iota\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\upsilon\tau\omicron$   $\delta\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$  D has  
 aliis ex regis persona loquentibus, aliis autem ex illius quidem  
 sententia. XVIII. 22. After  $\dot{\iota}\nu\delta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$   $\dot{\iota}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  cibus illis simplex est  
 habitus insumptuosus et mundus. 67.  $\epsilon\tau\dot{\iota}\delta\iota\omega\mu\epsilon\tau\iota$   $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega - \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\eta\tau\omicron$   
 $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ . D. et dignitate magna sullimis, idoneus autem ad munera  
 largienda sumptusque faciendos. Nam memoratae quoque muliere maiora  
 dona promiserat. Quae illa contempnente maximo fuerat ardore  
 succensus - indicating a lacuna after  $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega$ ; 242. After  $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$   
 ....et frater eius qui tetrarchiam ante possederant. 259. After  
 $\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\gamma\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$  et purgare quaecumque accusationibus subiacebant.  
 279.  $\pi\acute{\iota}\delta' \epsilon\nu \pi\acute{\omega} \alpha\phi\omicron\nu\tau\iota$   $\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$  et constituens in circuitu omnes  
 militias et turmas. 306.  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\gamma\chi\acute{\iota}$  cooperatus est <sup>(=  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\gamma\chi\epsilon\iota$ )</sup> autem petronio.  
 Nam tanta illi dilectio comperata est tam romae quam in uno quoque  
 regno, ut dei gratia super eum evidens appareret. Romae namque  
 senatorii ordinis et quotquot dignitatibus eminebant, tam virtutis  
 merito quam odio gaii quod propter eius crudelitatem iniquitatem  
 conceperant, circa petronium magno favore ferebantur. ~~(308)~~ —  
 ————— 328.  $\delta' \delta'$  cumque audisset (fratrem)

timore suum adventum subtraxerit. XIX. 117. συνημμένον erat enim  
 haec domus coniuncta regalibus. Niese. ad. loc - 'quamquam haec  
 graviter corrupta sunt.' 185. καὶ ἡ μὲν γλῶσση καταργήσεται  
 et celatura quidem est agnita nox autem continuo subsecuta. It is  
 noticeable that where Naber indicates a lacuna in his text, e.g.  
 Ant. XVII. 25; 40. 38. 105. XVIII. 113. 277. 287. 302. 343. XIX. 280.  
 287., D often has something which confirms the indication of a lacuna,  
 cf. XVIII. 277. Multo melius iudicat ut scriberet gaio ut eius  
 animum mitigans nicaeu per eum iniquum contingeret, aut forsitan  
 indignatione conciraretur quod eius mandata minime compleverit, et  
 adversus eum aliquid mali decerneret. Some of the additions, however,  
 are not of so much value, being often a mere paraphrase or synonymous  
 expression with less point than the Greek. e.g. XVII. 62. φίλτρον  
 amare se namque fingeat. 113. κρυπτὸν δόλον sed te occulto adversario  
 patris extante, claret quia illos non veluti patris insidiatores  
 habebas exosos. 120. Niese ad loc. says "Latina ---- similiter totam  
 orationem liberius transtulit." 285. πῦρ δ' ὁμοφύλου φόνον invidia  
 tamen contribulium civiumque suorum ad omnia nequitiae opera  
 ferebantur. (cf. XVII. 216. 217. 218.) 208. πρὶν εἰς Ῥώμην ὁδοῦν donec  
 iter ad romam quod propositum haberet sine tumultu perageret, et tum  
 cum de se voluntatem caesaris agnovisset respicere quid agendum foret,  
 et de cunctis petitionibus etsi eorum legitime dispositorum, neque  
 tunc tempus esse dissensionis aut contumelias ingerendi. XVIII. 12.  
 πρῶτον... ἀρχαῖων maiores natu competenti honore venerantur.  
 327. ~~καὶ αὐτὸς~~ <sup>καὶ αὐτὸς</sup> audiens. 331. ἡ καὶ πύτυ et ille manu valida  
 congregata praesertim in illis locis tam munitissimis facile persarum  
 imperium defensaret.

A number of cases show additions by D where the text was probably  
 not appreciably different from that which we now possess e.g. XVII. 32.  
 propter quod utilis ac promptus a rege putabatur. 33. et quod erat  
 procacissimus. 47. quod fore firmabat si societatem illius effugeret.  
 86. donec agnosceret quae domi mota gestaue fuissent. 224. siquidem  
 illud sana mente fecisset herodes. hoc autem iam sensu praevalitudine



diminuto conscripserat. (sensu, apparently, for sensus.) 268. eumque si adesset obidionem illam esse soluturum. 272. sed ad vim inferendam et ledendum pronior et protervus extabat. XVIII. 242. After βιπλῆς, et frater eius qui tetrarchiam illam ante possiderat. 259. After καθαγομένων et purgare quaecumque accusationibus subacebant. XIX. 65. δωροδοκῶτατος γὰρ ἦν καὶ ὑβριστότατος eo quod esset in muneribus accēpiendis et iniuriis exercendis acerrimus. XX. 100. ἀλαβάρχωντος alabarches id est princeps. The origin of these expressions is due sometimes to a desire to explain further the meaning (e.g. XX. 100.), sometimes because Latin cannot always express itself with such epigrammatic terseness as Greek.

Such are some of the main characteristics of the translation. What then is the value of D? At the outset, its importance must be admitted in Contra Ap. II. 51 - 113, which is wanting in all our Greek manuscripts. On the other hand the Latin version itself is not entirely complete, since it has no translation of the Vita, and omits Ant. XVI. 395 - 404. This passage gives a less favourable view of the Herodian House than elsewhere in the Antiquities, and it was probably appended to the second edition of the work which appeared with the Vita after the death of Agrippa II, the sole surviving member of the Herodian House, in 100 A.D. Since the Latin has neither the Vita or Ant. XVII. 395 - 404, then, which are probably the work of the second edition, it is tempting to conjecture that the Greek original of D was that of the first edition of the Antiquities. It is not in the least unlikely that Cassiodorus should have used a first edition, even though his mention of the Vita shows that he knew of its existence. e.g. Ant. XVII. τοσαύτῃ δυνάμει ἀπειρώσθων ἰσχυρῶς talibus enim mali loquiis eum induxerat, :205. ἐνὶ ἑκάστῳ ὁμίλῳ (Naber.) ἐνὶ ἑκάστῳ ὁμίλῳ sed in omnibus eos placabat. In both of these cases D seems to point to an older (and preferable) Greek text. These are examples, however, which go to show that the original of D was sometimes rather unreliable; e.g. Ant. XVII. 23. τό γένος et hoc quidem ex dispositione



factum erat herodis = γυνήμων, which is evidently an inferior Greek reading. 81. καὶ ἀπὸ ..... ἐγγύοντι et accusationi ... se totum dederat: accusationi does not give as good meaning as θρασείαν, and probably represents a corrupt διαβολήν or synonymous word. 109. μανίαν furiam = μανία, likewise inferior. 143. ἔπει δ' ὀχλὺς ἦν D. quum inimicus omnino repertus es. = ἀνεχθής, which does not give the same point. XVIII. 170. (cf. 173. end.) τετελευτήκοτες, D. nisi forte quisquam in aliqua depraehenderetur offensa = ἡδίκηκοτες. D is not translating freely here, but seems to be giving an equivalent of a word not in the Greek MSS. we have. ἡδίκηκοτες, however, is an inferior reading here, and cannot be conjectured.

Niese does not rate the version very highly: he rarely takes note even of its variant readings, and only accepts conjectures which they provide when P and the FLV group manuscripts are entirely corrupt. But the comparison of the Latin with the Greek shows that a number of improvements may be obtained from the Latin, in places where the Greek texts are ~~essentially~~ flagrantly corrupt. To accept a reading which is in a Greek MS. or MSS. because it has more or less unanimous support does not help far towards finding the actual text which Josephus wrote: no one with the knowledge of Greek, which Josephus had, would have allowed himself to write even such corrupt expressions as we sometimes find in the Greek. But the passages which provide a probable variant are comparatively rare. At other times we have to be content with D's confirmation of lacunas in the Greek text: here, evidently D preserves a reading which is probably correct, and what Josephus wrote, but not having even any letters of corrupt Greek words, whole passages cannot be rendered into Greek from the Latin. The Latin is by no means a word for word translation, nor was that, it seems, its object: there are times when Greek expresses itself so neatly, and with idiomatic brevity that no translation can hope to emulate it completely. ~~Consequently~~ Hence D is forced to add what seem, after the Greek, weak explanatory clauses. This is not

<sup>10</sup> cf. Adversaria in Josephum? " cf. Ant. x. 263.

always the reason for these clauses however: there are times when the "free" translation is responsible, and thus a long paraphrase may be found. Conversely, there are omissions, apart from those which are due to the particular family of Greek manuscripts to which D's original belonged: these omissions are found in speeches particularly, the avowed object of which is to give the gist of words spoken or probably spoken.<sup>12</sup> Niese calls it "infirma Latina", and it was, we may assume, the type of Latin in vogue in the sixth century, at the time of writing. It is of most value, for textual criticism, in short sentences: the longer the sentence, the greater the tendency to paraphrase, or to shorten, or to make the translation so free as to be incapable of re-translation. Even to-day, if a body of experts translated a passage of Greek into Latin accurately and word for word, but not so as to make nonsense of the Latin, and others then tried to retranslate their efforts into Greek, the results would in all probability be diverse: firstly, the translations into Latin would differ, and still more the retranslations. This may explain the value of the Latin version. Where it can be of any use to the Greek text, the Greek is generally corrupt, yet not so hopelessly that words cannot be roughly ascertained and letters altered. Thus it appears that if the Latin version helps the Greek text greatly, the Greek text must be corrupt, as we have it: the more numerous the occasions on which this help is given, the more frequent the corruptions in the Greek tend to be. (Compare the section "Adversaria in Josephum", in general. Some particular examples may be selected, which show not only the corruption in the Greek, but help it greatly by providing an alternative which seems much preferable and correct. e.g. Ant. XVII.3.

τομήδε εὐνὴν ἀρεῖσενδον ἀρμὶ talibus eum mali loquiis eum induxerat.

Comparing XVII. 123. κτερότωδε incitabatur, the following translation

results τομήδε κτερότωδε διαβολαῖς 91. οἱ ἐκλύθη ,

in quae mala devenerit, thus adding κκῶν to the Greek, which is lacking.

(κκῶν follows, so that confusion with κκῶν could easily arise.)

108. ἀναλίσσει D reliquisse = ἀρδύσειν . 134. οἱκῶν D - a duobus

<sup>12</sup> cf. Thuc. I. 22. 1.



domesticis (= οἰκετῶν or, preferably οἰκεῖων IAM.) 205. εὐτεὶ ἤρξατο δμῶσος

— sed in omnibus eos placabat = ἀεὶ μεμίσσετο δ' ὅπως αἰρὸς τὰ πάντα.

212. ἀλλῶν ἀξιόντων D adds aliis ex regis persona loquentibus, which is the τῶν μὲν...- clause wanting in the Greek. 262. εἶκεν (Naber.)

ἤκεν (Niese.) : ignem confestim suscepit = ἐκάη (Niese's conjecture.)

XVIII. 118. ἤρθυσαν Naber: ἤσθυσαν Niese: D ad audiendum eum

per plurima multitudo concurreret. This suggests καὶ γὰρ συνήχθυσαν

ἀκρόσται ἐν τῇ ἀκροαταίᾳ τῶν λόγων. 131. Τίμος this, as a proper

name seems questionable: D honorabilis vir = τίμος (adjective.)

281. στελλῶ (στελλῶ MWE) scribam = στελλῶ (supported by πηγύσμαι 282):

(282) ἀμύψω 283 : 300. τὴν ἀρχὴν ..... τὴν οἰκείαν ἀρετὴν mox vero virtutem

agrippae miratus, quod suum regnum non redivitis non pecuniis = τὴν

ἀρετὴν ..... τὴν οἰκείαν ἀρχὴν. The context too demands this. 354. τῶν

ἀκρόστων πρὸς ἐν ἡλικίᾳ Niese conjectured ὁμοτῶν. D sed etiam aetate

ferrentium non minimam manum = πρὸς ἀκρόστας τῶν ἐν ἡλικίᾳ. XIX. 120. οὓς

ἀν νομισώσι. quibuscumque congressi hostibus = οἷς ἂν ὁμός' ἦσι.

185. Τρεβέλλιος the reading of the Latin 'trebellius'. Greek codd. -

Στρεβέλλιος. 195. καὶ πάντων ἐν ἀνυχίᾳ = et omnes in luctu positos.

Greek MSS. corrupt, ἀνυχίῳ H: ἐν ἀνυχίῳ W. 205. ἐν ὑποδοχῇ codd: propter

adventum. = ἐφ' ὑποδοχῇ. 250. ἐν ἀδμονίᾳ (Naber.) : ἐν ἀνίᾳ Niese.

contraria erant vota senatus et populi = τῷ δήμῳ ἐναντία (ἐναντία MWE.)

τὰ τῶν συγκαληπκῶν ἦν. 334. Θάπτον Hudson's emendation from the Latin

magis for the corrupt Greek ἀπὸν ἢ τὸν, which makes ἦ pointless

without a comparative. So that the value placed upon the Latin for textual criticism must reflect our estimate of the Greek manuscripts.

It is useless to expect too much from the Latin version, as far as the Greek text is concerned, because there is no evidence that its purpose was to establish the Greek text at all. Latin was becoming the universal language in the sixth century, and Greek was gradually becoming confined to the Eastern half of the Empire; hence, Latin translations were made of Greek works. - Such seems to be the purpose underlying the translation, to have the works in the language which was most frequently in use at the time. But, however much it may be



deplored, there was, speaking generally, no such interest in textual criticism at that time as there is to-day, and a study of the Latin solely in the hopes of correcting our Greek texts seems doomed to disappointment: the nature of the translation goes against the attainment of such hopes, except in comparatively few instances, where our Greek texts are undoubtedly corrupt. All that was wanted from the Latin was an intelligible narrative, smoothly written, according to the canons of the style of the period. For this the Latin version succeeds in its purpose: but its purpose, and therefore its value, are of necessity limited.

### Adversaria in Josephum.

The following "adversaria" have been suggested by a comparison of Naber's text of Josephus with an eleventh century Latin manuscript, containing the "Antiquities" and the "Bellum Judaicum", in the Cathedral Library, Durham. (D.).

The manuscript is a typical one, giving the Latin version of Josephus' works, which was made at the instance of Cassiodorus, in the <sup>5th</sup> fifth century A.D. Niese, in the introduction to his edition of Josephus' works, says that these manuscripts are very numerous.

Sometimes, the Latin version is useful in filling out lacunae, or of establishing them, in the Greek text; and it has been used for this purpose. Where the readings of the Greek manuscripts conflict, the Latin version may be of use to decide between them. It does not follow, however, that the Latin version is necessarily of greater value than the Greek manuscripts which we possess, because, as far as can be judged, it must have been made from inferior Greek manuscripts.

### Ant. XIV.

- 36 Ἀλεξάνδρου aristoboli filii alexandri D. Unde <Ἀριστοβούλου>  
Ἀλεξάνδρου <αἰδός> legendum est, quia Ἀλεξάνδρου ab Ἀριστοβούλου (34)  
plane abhorret.
- 36 ἱστορήκμεν vidimus D. Hac lectione, Latina versio confirmat -  
quod a priori verisimilius est - habuisse quondam quosdam Graecos  
codices εἶδμεν. Itaque pro ἱστορήκμεν legendum est εἶδμεν.
- 49 συρρεφωγότης quo aristobulus confugerat D. "confugerat"  
monstrat συρρεφωγότης haud per se corruptum esse, excidisse tamen  
aliquid de eis cum quibus Aristobulus in castrum venerat. Unde  
supplendum est, post Ἀριστοβούλου, <εἰς ὃν ποτὶ> συρρεφωγότης.
- 51 ὥστε ποὺ μὴ καταλύειν αὐτόν. Quae verba, haud sana, non habet D.  
Inesse videtur talis sententia, "ne Pompeius se, id est  
Aristobulum, regno exueret". Latet corruptela quaedam fortasse in  
καταλύειν Itaque <sup>†</sup>καταλύειν<sup>†</sup>.
- 53 αἰδὸς αὐτοῦ γενομένην mithridatem hausto veneno defunctum quod  
illi filius suus farnaces confecerat D. Ex Lat. lege αἰδὸς  
<φερμάκῃ> γενομένην : verisimile est φερμάκῃ quondam interiisse  
ex similitudine φερμάκου.

58. ἀργύνουν αὐτὸν κἀκείνον ἔχειν *persuadebant et illum haberi*  
vinetum D. Om. τῷ PE et Lat: et hoc loco τῷ inutile est.  
Itaque melius ἀργύνουν κἀκείνον ἔχειν.
69. διὰ μέσων in medio D. Confirmant igitur <sup>(ab. com),</sup> ~~Acet~~ M<sub>1</sub> et D διὰ μέσων.
71. μυρίους καὶ δισμυρίους viginti duo milia D. Confirmat Lat.  
δισμυρίους LAMW.
96. ὤχυρον τε τὸ χωρίον munitissimum oppidum D. Codex ex quo D  
translatus est, videtur habuisse ὀχυρώτατον χωρίον (confer XIV.450)
99. ἥν ἐκ' Ἀρχέλαον ἐστείλατο gabinii deinde militibus antipater  
ministravit triticum et arma D. ἐφ' Ἑλεμνόν codd, sed Bell. Jud.  
I.175, Hircanum et Antipatrum subvenisse Gabinio tradit. Alii  
igitur ἐκ' Ἀρχέλαον Hudson auctore malunt, alii rectius fortasse  
ἐκ' Ἀγούτων.
102. στρατῷ γὰρ exercitum haberet tria milia iudeorum D. Genitivus  
casus στρατῷ difficilior est. Ex Lat. conjici potest στρατόν  
iuxta τρεῖς μυριάδας positum.
115. Κυρηναίων quattuor partes D. Supplet Lat. id quo Graeci codd.  
carent. Κυρηναίων (στάτης).
131. διεκώλουν σὶ Ἰουδαίῃσι . . . κτισκύνειν cum egyptii iudei transire  
provinciam vetarent qui oniae dicuntur D. Confirmat Lat. Ἀγούτων  
post Ἰουδαίῃσι (FLAMME), retinetque σὶ ἐκ τῆς Ὀνίου λεγόμεναι ,  
sicut in Ant. XVI. 287. τὴν . . . χώραν κτισκύνειν sane false  
illata sunt explanationis causa.
141. στρατηγῇ μετρίῳ quanta ipse laborasset in expeditione coram ipso  
cesare D. Retinet lat. Caesaris mentionem quae ex Graecis codd.  
excidit, sed ipsa Josephi vocabula inveniri non possunt. Lacuna  
igitur statuenda post στρατηγῇ μετρίῳ \*
159. βλάπτει . . . ὁ νεανίας cum nichil offuit iuventus, dum prudentiam  
super aetatem haberet D. Itaque cod. ex quo Lat. translata est,  
tale habuisse videtur , γυναικόπρος (ἢ καὶ ἡλικίαν) ὁ νεανίας .
184. αἰθεῖται . . . μόνον flexus his herodes et arbitratus satisfactum quod  
suam fortitudinem genti monstrasset, reversus est D. Lat. non  
transfert μόνον , sed καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν (reversus est). Quod  
verbum finem desideratum sententiae supplet.
227. ἀγίων et concedo patriis uti legibus secundum solemnes et sacras  
immolationes, et congregare, sicut solent, pro sacrificiis



- pecunias D. Latet corruptela: ἀγίων FLAMM: ἀγίους Niese. Lat. liberius transfert, neque auxilio est in explanando καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν τὰς θυσίας ἀφαιρέματων. Corruptelae signa statuenda sunt post ἀφαιρέματων et ante καὶ
- 249 αὐτῶν ... ἐβόαν et si quid aliud ab eis abstulit reddat, et liceat eis a portibus deportare quae volunt D. αὐτῶν Gronovius: αὐτῶν Gutschmid. Lat. suggerit αὐτοῖς, quod haud absconum post ἐβόαν et tale aliquid interiisse monstrat, ὅσα βούλονται Ex Lat. varia lectio αὐτοῖς ... ἐβόαν (ὅσα βούλονται).
- 271 ἀπελυσόμενος qui cum apamenum exercitum accepisset, obsidionem solvens D. A ratione ἀπελυσόμενος abhorret, quod Bassus Murcum iam obsidebat. Unde melius ex Lat. Συρίαν. ἀπελυσὼν δέ.
- 294 (295) ἔμψ̄ felix D. Erat hic dux Romanus, sed ἔμψ̄ Romanum nomen non significat. Ex Lat. conjici potest φημψ̄.
- 305 διατάγματ' αὐτοῦ τῶντα decreta huiusmodi continentia D. • διατάγματ' singulare, haud recte scriptum, quia tria decreta sunt (306-313, 314-318, 319-322). Lat. (decreta) variam lectionem διατάγματα praebet: διατάγματα αὐτοῦ τῶντα.
- 311 ἐκείθεν in posterum pace ἔμψ̄ licebit D. Pro ἐκείθεν Lat. habuisse videtur ἐβόαν (licebit).
- 349 ἀρόσσει Πακόρω cum querelis accedit D. Add. Lat. cum querelis, et sententiam supplet. Excidit fortasse ἀγανκτηῶν  
ἀρόσσει Πακόρω (ἀγανκτηῶν) κτλ.
- 361 Θρήσκα (400 Θρήσαν) siria D (400 risan) - utraque corrupta. Coni. Schlatter Ὀρήσκα (400 Ὀρήσαν) - confer Bell. Jud. I. 266, 294.
- 380 ἐπὶ δὲ κινδυνώειν post vero deflebat suos familiares periclitari D. Lacunam post ἐπὶ δὲ κινδυνώειν a Niese indicatam, supplet Lat. (deflebat). Itaque εἴτα (τὸ) ἐπὶ δὲ κινδυνώειν αὐτῷ (κατεδάκρυε).
- 384 μετ' αὐτῶν messala et atratinus D. (Conf. XV. 361.) Constat hos socios fuisse, neque unum post alterum rem iniisse. Itaque legendum est ex Lat. μετ' αὐτοῦ.
- 447 (Συρίαν) ἀπελίσσωσι sosio quidem antonius praecepit auxilium herodi praebere, ipse vero ad egiptum discessit D. Codd. Graeci hoc loco plerumque vitiosi. Indicat Niese lacunam post ἀπελίσσωσι: Hudson addidit Συρίαν ex Bell. Jud. I. 327. Om. δ' ἀπελίσσωσι, et sententiam aliter et contentiam aliter punctam tradit.  
μνηστικὴν tradit: - Σοσίων μὲν Ἀντώνιος ἀπεκείνωσεν Ἡρώδης συμπαροῦς.

ὡπὸς δὲ ἐν Ἀιγύπτῳ ἐχώρει.

450 κρηγῶς δὲ πῶν νεκρῶν cum inimicos vicisset D. Haud a ratione  
abhorret dicere 'cum inimicos vicisset', quod de pugna agitur in

449 : sed prope absurdum est dicere κρηγῶς πῶν νεκρῶν, quod iam  
victor erat, et insuper aene similia sunt νεκρῶν et ἐχθρῶν.

Ex Lat. itaque lege κρηγῶς δὲ πῶν ἐχθρῶν.

450 ἐρωχύρου. oppidum gittam runitissimum capit D. Confer ad 96.

Varia lectio ex Lat. Γίτθων <εἰκω> χωρίον ὀχυρώτατον.

460 ἐκτὸς πῶν περῶν Om. D. Loci sensus desiderare videtur ἐντὸς (codd.  
πῶν τοίχων (confer 459).

463 διὰ φόβον ἦσαν. qui in eadem domo pro timore celati fuerant  
invadunt D. Videtur habuisse cod. a quo Lat. translata est,  
διὰ φόβου ἦσαν.

470 ἐν εὐθυμίᾳ τοῦ δήμου multaque pro solatio populi D. Approbat  
cod. E, et confirmat Lat. ἐν εὐθυμίᾳ τοῦ δήμου.

## Ant. XV.

- 59 ἀρεκρότε unde potius suam vitam tenebat D. Confirmat Lat.  
ἀρεκράτε LAMW, sed tamen ἀρεκράτε τὸν βίον rarum est, neque  
idcirco Josepho quidem impossibile. ἀρεκρότε saltem absurdum  
est.
- 90 εἰς εὐπορίαν..... quod solum potuisset avaritiae illius satisfacere D.  
Excidit aliquid ex graec. codd. Unde Dindorf post εὐπορίαν  
lacunam indicavit. Retinet Lat. verbum quod interiit. Ex  
satisfacere conjici potest olim graec. codd. habuisse ἡρεκρῶσαι  
τῇ τῆς ἀδικούσης πλεονεξίᾳ.
- 109 ὑβήμενων redditibus et viribus collectis D. Codd. graec. εὐρημένων  
haud recte. Suggestit Lat. ex 'collectis' συνεκλεμμένων..
- 129 δεινόν quod nichil sunt quae nobis mala supervenerunt D.  
Confirmat Lat. δεινῶν LAMW, quod per se pratum est, et haud  
spemenda auctoritate fultum.
- 140 ἄπρον... ἐνέδρα; in primo vero proelio nomen et fortitudo nostra  
apparuit, in posteriore vero iniquitate vel insidiis concidimus D.  
Aliam versionem hoc loco Lat. tradit, et habuisse videtur:—ἀρότερον  
μὲν γὰρ ἀνδραγαθία ἡμῶν ἐνίκησεν, δευτέρᾳ (ἢ δειντέρᾳ) δὲ ἀπανομία τούτων καὶ ἐνέδρα.
- 149 τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ idem D. Desiderat χρόνοςύντων accusativum casum.  
Ex Lat. supplendum est τὸ αὐτό (idem). Itaque praevalet τοῦ δὲ  
τὸ αὐτὸ καί.
- 150 ἐγγυόνει... Quod statim spes iudeis non minores erexit, virtutemque  
accendit D. Rursus lacuna in graec. codd. indicanda est.  
Praestat autem Lat. unde suppleatur sensus quidem loci qui interiit  
τούτῃ εὐθὺς ἐλαΐδας π. τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις οὐ μικρὰ ἐνέγκουσιν, καὶ ἀρετὴν ἐνέγκουσιν,  
ὃ δὲ πρὸς δυνάμειν αὐτῶν καὶ
- 154 οἱ π. Ἰουδαῖοι iudaei autem D. auctore Lat. recte fortasse  
legendum οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι, ut arabes (151-153) et iudei qui eos  
persequebantur (154) distinguantur
- 170 ἐπ' ἐγγυόνει sed haec paraverunt D. ἐπ' ἐγγυόνει minus recte quam ἐνέγγυονει  
quod Lat. suggerit, ex 'paraverunt'.
- 181 ἴππεον et quod pessimum est, ut diximus, in senectute non dignum  
vitae terminum impetravit D. Carent graec. codd. verbo, quod ad  
'impetravit' respondeat. ἴππεον, igitur, ex Lat. meliorem sensum



- 185 ἐπ' αὐτῶν κατακλινάων super easdem mittens D. Ex D conjici potest ἐπ' αὐτῆς. Illum sensum locus desiderat, Herodem non castello-cui nomen iam dux praecerat-sed mulieribus custodes imposuisse. Itaque ἐπ' αὐτῆς κατακλινάων.
- 188 ἀνυποστήμῃως sine dubitatione D. Flagitat locus sensum 'sine supplicii timore', quem ἀνυποστήμῃως praebere non potest. Itaque Lat. fretus, confer Ant. XVI. 69, et lege ἀνυποστόλως.
- 190 τὸν γὰρ — φίλον. Nam qui fatetur amicum vel benefactorem habere aliquem D. Adhibenda quaedam correctio graec. codd. Lat. habuisse τὸ γὰρ ὁμολογούντα μὲν πρὸς εἶναι φίλον. Itaque ad eundem referunt πρὸς et ἐκείνον, sed apud Josephum non impossibile est.
- 196 κείσμεν, δωρεοσέμεως. Cumque super vires suas dona optulisset ..... petebat ne D. Sententiam aliter et rectius fortasse punctam habet D: — κείσμεν. δωρεοσέμεως (δὲ) ὅτι δύνανται μεγαλοφυμίαν, ἡγεῖτο [δὲ] κεί. 206 ὡς ὡς dum tamen non omnino speraret eum cum eadem insignior D. Carent graec. codd. vocabulo quod ad μέγιστα μὲν respondet. Ex Lat., praecipue ex 'sed ut potius' conjici potest pro ὡς ὡς, εἰ δὲ μή, quod ad μέγιστα μὲν respondere solet.
- 233 ὧν ἐκείνη nam volens ostendere se ignorare causam D. ὧν solum, est difficile. Confirmat D praepositionem excidisse, quae genitivum casum habet. Itaque legendum ὧν (ἐνταῦθα) ἐκείνη.
- 240 [εὐρύτερον] ἡρῶν. Om. D. [εὐρύτερον]. Dubium ἡρῶν, et fortasse corruptum. Lege † ἡρῶν †.
- 255 μᾶλλον ὥστε τῆς εὐτυχίας. elevatus felicitatem paulatim excedebat D. In graec. codd. nunc εἰσβάνων vim absolutam praeter morem habet. D tamen plane 'felicitatem' transfert cum 'excedebat' (εἰσβαίνει) coniunctum. Itaque... μᾶλλον, (καὶ) ὥστε τὴν εὐτυχίαν [καὶ] μικρὸν εἰσβαίνει.
- 259 ἀφέντος dimittatur D. ἀφέντος FLAMV. Qui codd. cum Lat. coniuncti auctoritatem prope certam pro ἀφέντος praebent. Conf. etiam Ant. XV. 265.
- 278 τεταραγμένους ὁρῶν καὶ Herodes autem turbatus et intelligens D. Ex D conjici potest τεταραγμένος καὶ ὁρῶν, verba Josepho idonea et graec. codd. similia.
- 291 ῥᾴδιον non remissiore... sed multo potius cautiore D. ῥᾴδιον paene intelligi potest: itaque ex D lege ῥᾴδιον. μή post εἰ in graec. codd. haud bonum sensum praebet, et auctore D iure omitti potest.

- Lege itaque οὐ εἶναι ἐπὶ τὸν Ἡρώδην, ἢ [μὴ] μετὰ αἰώνος ἀσφαλείας κρατοῦν.  
 336 πολλοὺς μὲν ..... πολλοὺς δέ. multos ..... plures D. Neque idonea  
 Josepho neque ullo modo propria vocabula πολλοὺς μὲν ..... πολλοὺς δέ.  
 D habuisse videtur πολλοὺς μὲν ..... αἰῶνους δέ, quod fortasse praevallet  
 326 τὴν ἐπιμελείαν δέ. timore quidem ..... diligentia vero D. In D,  
 'diligentia vero' cum 'timore quidem' respondet. Non ita graec.  
 codd., etsi testibus μὲν ..... δέ, tale desideratur. Conjici igitur  
 potest τῇ ἐπιμελείᾳ δέ.  
 340 ἔχουσαι quae subter cloacas non minores superioribus aedificiis  
 habet, quarum aliae D. Codex ex quo Lat. translata est, habuisse  
 videtur ἔχοντα. Nunc quidem carent verbo graec. codd. in hac  
 sententia, et cum participio ἔχουσαι scire licet εἶπ'. Fortasse  
 igitur ἔχοντα rectius.  
 349 ἀναστρέφει reversus est D. ἀποστρέφει E, quod Lat. confirmat.  
 ἀναστρέφει haud recte, quia Roma redibat: quam significationem  
 ἀναστρέφει hoc loco non dat. (x 350 ἀναστρέφει recte.) Legendum  
 igitur, cum E, ἀποστρέφει.  
 359 ἀροῦντος καὶ ἐμπεπότης . temeritatis non peccati D. Loci sensus  
 negare videtur καὶ ἐμπεπότης rectum esse, quia si Herodes  
 peccavisset (quod significat καὶ codd. graec.) non dimisisset eum  
 sine supplicio Augustus. Difficultatem solvit apte Lat. (non  
 peccati) Lege igitur ἀροῦντος καὶ (σὺχ) ἐμπεπότης.  
 360 τὴν πύπυ μῆραν. et huius possessionis partem non parvam D.  
 Difficile est tradere πύπυ μῆραν, nisi intelligas μῆραν ad  
 ('bona' respondere. 'Pars' tamen (D) suggerit non ad significationem  
 'bona' intelligendum esse μῆραν, sed ad arcanam vocabuli  
 significationem - 'pars'. Itaque ut hoc etiam in graec. codd. fiat,  
 post τὴν et ante πύπυ, lege πῶν...τὴν (πῶν) πύπυ μῆραν.  
 361 μετ' αὐτὸν Ἀγρίππα caesar vel agrippa D. Confer ad Ant. XIV. 384.  
 Legendum est μετ' αὐτοῦ Ἀγρίππα.  
 366 ἦσαν δὲ in civitate pariter et in viis. Nam erant qui D. Lat.  
 rursus aliter punctam sententiam tradit, et fortasse melius. ...καὶ  
 τῆς οὐνοπορείας. ἦσαν(υπερ) δὲ καὶ.  
 367 αὐτὴν αὐτὴν ἣν ἔχουσιν experimentum faciens quid ... sentirent D.  
 Prop absurdum sensum hoc loco praebent graec. codd., "experimentum  
 facere, quod habent". Ex 'sentirent' insere post ἔχουσιν, δίδουσιν.

Itaque αὖτις αὖτις ἢ ἔχουσιν (διάνοιαν)

- 374 ἀνέρις regnabis inquit feliciter D. Secundum 'regnabis', D habuisse videtur ἀνέρις, sed hoc non certum. Illud vero certum, vitiosum esse ἀνέρις. Itaque adhibenda corruptionis signa, <sup>†</sup>ἀνέρις<sup>†</sup>
- 412 ἀν' ἀκρὸς τοῦ πέγους a tercio tecto D. Ex D, dicendum est fortasse quondam aliquos graec. codd. legisse ἀν' ἀκρὸς τοῦ πέγους.



## Ant. XVI.

- 4 ἡπὺ ..... νεομικότος non regis sed tyranni tormentum excogitatum  
D. νεωμικότος codd. haud recte, quod θένει inutile fieri  
videtur. Conjici potest ἡπὺν ..... νεομικότων, quod est Josepho  
idoneum, et Lat. non repugnante verisimile. Est igitur absoluta  
constructio cum casu genitivo, quae pendere ad finem sententiae  
videtur. Itaque ἡπὺν ..... νεομικότων.
- 16 ἠρογγυμένον AMW. sciens exercitum ad hosforum producturum D. Haud  
recte AMW, quod de altera expeditione omnino non agitur. Quam ob  
rem verbum ἠρογγυῖσθαι P meliorem sensum adhibet, quia Romani  
ἠρογγυῖσθαι praecipue utebantur, in agmine exercitus describendo.  
Suggerit etiam Lat. futurum ἠρογγυσόμενον, quod secundum loci sensum  
haud spernendum est. Itaque ἠρογγυσόμενον.
- 24 ἡ δεισιπείας. M. dum largitionibus minime parceret D. ἡ δεισιπείας  
prope absurdum, quia non de humanitate agitur. Flagitat loci  
sensus, non repugnante D, verbum, fortasse ἐπικουρίζειν.
- 62 ἀνελύχσαν. discesserunt D. Ex quo fit coniectura ἀνελύχσαν  
Quod melius esse videtur, quia Herodes et Agrippa a Lesbo usque ad  
Samon una navigabant.
- 84 οὗ δίκαιον tanquam iniustum D. δίκαιον per se haud perfectum.  
Ex D supplendum est (ὥς). Itaque (ὥς) οὗ δίκαιον κτλ.
- 117 τί σοι ..... εὐταρκής quis tibi ad fidem sufficiet D. Approbat  
D, et confirmat P, lectionem similem sed meliorem τίς ..... εὐταρκής.
- 119 ἀπολαμβάνεις. si recipias ..... possumus vivere D. ἀπολαμβάνεις  
ad ζήσμεν respondere oportet, quod bene fieri non potest in rebus  
praesentibus. Ex D, 'recipias', verisimile est olim habuisse codd.  
graec. ἀπολαμβάνεις quod ad futurum tempus refert. Itaque  
fortasse ἀπολαμβάνεις.
- 132 πρὸς ἄλλους. inutilis hoc loco D. Conjecit Niese ὅχλους, pro  
ὅλους PW. Apud Josephum fortasse πρὸς ὅλους haud spernenda  
auctoritate fultum, idem valere potest quod πρὸς πάντας. Unde  
facile corruptio fiebat, explanandi causa. Itaque πρὸς ὅλους.
- 137 δρόμον cursusque equorum D. Quod suggerit δρόμους. Nam si ludos  
magnifice paravisset - quod re vera factum est - haud unum cursum  
equorum solum statuisset.
- 148 ἡμῶν ὁποῖός Abest a D. Participium excidisse videtur, quod olim

- idem quod κατὰ τορίως valebat: fortasse igitur (κορηγός) legendum est — τούτων στομῆς (κορηγός) ἀπ' ἐκείνου κτλ.
- 150 ἡενύθη μὴ συνομολογεῖν quis potest negare? D. Ex D, aut ἡδυνήθη pro ἡενύθη emendandi causa adhibendum est, aut ἡενύθη retento, μὴ συνομολογεῖν omittendum est. ἡδυνήθη μὴ συνομολογεῖν.
- 154 κακόν AM. dum praesentibus consumptis pecuniis, alias vellet acquirere D. Codex ex quo Lat. translata est, habuisse videtur non κακόν, sed καίνων.
- 163 τὰ π' ἐφ' οἷν et pecunias ab eis D. Confer 164, 168, 169, 170, ubi coniuncta sunt vocabula τὰ ἐφ' χρήματα. Inest etiam D, hoc loco, χρήματα (pecunias). Itaque inserendum graec. codd. χρήματα. Lege τὰ π' ἐφ' (χρήματα) οἷν.
- 170 καὶ ὥς ..... κωλύοντο . affliguntur occasione tributorum quae nequaquam debent, et prohibentur solemnia sua peragere D. Nunc quidem infinitivum desiderat κωλύοντο, quod retinet D, et suggerit omittenda vocabula καὶ ὥς. Itaque legendum fortasse [καὶ ὥς] ..... κωλύοντο (μὴ τὰ ἐφ' οἷν) εἶζεν.
- 170 καὶ εἰ πυνῶν ἐφ' ..... πῶν πολιτῶν, πύς . sed et si quas sacras pecunias cives abstulerunt, has ipsis reddi praecipio D. Confusi graec. codd. Confirmat D πυνῶν ἐφ' AM, et suggerit πῶν πολιτῶν πύς et meliorem sensum praestat. Itaque εἰ πυνῶν ἐφ' ..... πῶν πολιτῶν πύς κτλ.
- 174 συνεγούμεθα. sed et defendebamur D. Ex D conjici potest συνεγούμεθα quia teste D, apud graec. codd. tempora olim erant verborum συνεγούμεθα et ἐκωλύθημω praeterita, non ut nunc, mixta. Itaque συνεγούμεθα.
- 179 τὰς ἐφ' (χρεῖας) καὶ τὰς . consumptis suis pecuniis D. τὰς ..... (χρεῖας) — τὰς coni. Bekker. Lat. non satis plena hoc loco. πύς ἐφ' καὶ πύς bonum sensum praebet, et auctoritate AM confirmatur. Itaque εἰς πύς ἐφ' καὶ τὰς εἰ τῇ βασιλείᾳ χρεώμενός.
- 181 χρυσῶν ornatum vero et vasa aurea plura tulit D. Adjectivum χρυσῶν valde dubium. Auctore D, lege χρυσῶ quod ad κρημνίων respondet, et clausulam bene definitam reddit.
- 213 συνθεῖναι persuasit D. (in oratione recta.) συνέειναι coni Wolf: συμπτέειν PW. Tempus futurum in συμπτέειν difficile est, sed ipsum verbum rectum. Suggestit D συμπτέειν.



- 221 [σύν]ηνός pro causa quadam D. Ex quadam conjici potest non removendum σύν cum Naber, sed transponenda σύν et ηνός . Itaque ηνσσύν .
- 221 θελεῖεν loquitur de nuptiis eius D. Nullam mentionem graec. codd. faciunt de qua re colloquebatur, sed hoc desideratur, et a Lat. suppletur. Inserere igitur fortasse <πρὶ γάμων> .
- 222 φησύντων . cum ad cenam convenissent D. Dubium videtur esse φησύντων . Hic autem non subvenit Lat. graec. codd. Adhibenda signa corruptionis + φησύντων+ .
- 232 χειζόμενων ad gratiam antipatri confessi sunt D. Ex D, χειζόμενοι melius est quam χειζομένων . χειζόμενοι igitur legendum est.
- 235 χαλεπῶς moleste tulit D. χαλεπῶς (sc. ἐκλεβών ) est difficile, et sententiae concordiae officit : excidit nempe aliquid quod ad ἐκλεβών . respondebat. Ex D conjici potest interlisse φέρων , nam χαλεπῶς φέρω a Josepho saepe usurpatur : confer Ant. XVI. 232. Itaque χαλεπῶς <φέρων> κτλ.
- 257 τὸ θάπτον quatinus eum occidentes perficerent D. Emendat Dindorf τοὺς codd., cum τὸ . Fieri potest ut Lat. habuerit τῷ sicut cod. E. Utebantur graeci scriptores τῷ cum infinitivo-verbo ut exprimerent ob quam rationem aliquid fieret. Sic fortasse et hic, τῷ
258. 321. καὶ γὰρ ἄτι nam nichil aliud videtur (258) D : et quid amplius (321) D. Haud recte Naber. Melius Niese καὶ π' γὰρ ἢ sed non satis fortasse. Excidisse videtur ἄλλο , quod D quidem habuit. π' γὰρ <ἄλλο> ἢ
- 261 ἦκεν . in iudaeam venit D. Sensus ἦκεν non per se completus est, quia abest ulla mentio loci quo venisset. Unde fortasse excidit ex graec. codd. quod plane in Lat. erat - ἦκεν <εἰς Ἰουδαίαν> κτλ.
- 264 λαθὼν ἐκ . rex mutatus ab iracundia dum putaret iusta acta esse quae fecisset, paulatim ad patris affectum rediit D. λαβών codd. M haud recte. Imutilis hic Lat. Flagitat autem loci sensus pro λαβών , λαφών ἐκ : corruptum saltem λαβών , et signa corruptionis adhibenda. + λαβών+ .
- 274 δούλους procuratores regis omnes domuerunt D. Unde constat codicem ex quo Lat. translata est δούλους legisse pro δούλους .  
Cum



- 281 ἡλέγχοντο arabes autem pausi sunt D. Suggestit D ἡνείχοντο pro ἡλέγχοντο. Confer Ant. XII. 293. ἡνείχετο. Latrones certe apud arabes erant (conf. 291, 292), neque id accusatione dignum. Meliorem sensum praebet ἡνείχοντο, quod vi compulsi arabes eos inviti tolerabant.
- 281 τῇ βασιλείᾳ et qui de utroque regno confugissent invicem reddere D. Indicat lacunam post βασιλείᾳ recte Hiesse, sed Lat. ea quae exciderunt supplet. Conjici potest olim graec. coll. habuisse τῇ βασιλείᾳ <φυγάδης? ἀποδοῦναι>.
- 290 αὐτό qui cum hoc ei dicere ei compellerentur D. Secundum "ei" in D librarii negligentia ortum, sed fieri potest ut "ei" ad αὐτῷ respondeat, non αὐτό. αὐτῷ igitur conjici potest.
- 292 οἷς ἐλεγκάσθην. Tunc quoque trachonitidem habitantes cum arabis egressi custodiam iudeorum afflixerunt D. οἷς AHE, bonae auctoritatem habet sed desiderat praepositionem aut verbum quod dativum casum gubernat. Ex D, igitur, legendum est οὖν : οἷς συνελεγκάσθην.
- 300 κἀκεῖ μὲν. Direxit autem nicolaum demassenum D. Non igitur transfert D ipsa vocabula κἀκεῖ μὲν, sed ex rei consideratione habuisse videtur κἀκεῖσε μὲν, id est, ad Roman, quod tamen non exprimitur, sed scire licet. Confer Ant. XVI. 299 εἴνυν ὡς εἰς Ῥώμην ἀποστέλλειν, quod approbat κἀκεῖσε μὲν. Et enim "locum" exprinere (κἀκεῖ) non solet lingua graeca (nam non potest κἀκεῖ μὲν id valere quod καὶ τότε μὲν), sed "notum" exprinere mavult. Itaque legendum est κἀκεῖσε μὲν.
- 316 εἰς ἱερῶνι .. Demonstraverunt etiam aurum in iherone celatum D. Suggestit D aurum in oppido celatum esse. Confer Ant. XIV. 75, ubi de oppido Ἱερὸν mentio fit. Conjiciendum hic fortasse Ἱερῶνι, eo magis quod ἱερῶνι parum verisimile est.
- 322 ὑπαγόμενος existinans D. σόμενος Zonaras : ὑπαγόμενος AHE. Difficilia ὑπαγόμενος et ὑπαγόμενος, et obscura. Approbat D σόμενος, sicut Zonaras.
- 347 ἐλάμβανον cum eis retiebatur D. Sensum enim qui desideratur - secundum foedus spoliis eis impertiebatur - non praebent graec. coll. Melius igitur fortasse, ex D, μετέλαμβανον.

- 383 καὶ μὲν τὸ πᾶθος . . quod multitudo tacens crudelitatem tuam  
conspicit, et odit exercitus quoque cunctus D. Sententiam aliter  
punctam habuisse videtur D. μὲν(εὶ) ἡ[π]στέρῃ πᾶσι, κτλ.
- 393 οὐδὲν ἐπιγέγραπτον criminabatur coram omnibus D. οὐδὲν superfluum  
est. Suggestit D post ἐκδόντων olim fuisse verbum, quod, quia de  
"senatu" agitur, ἐκδόντων fieri potest. In codicibus scribendis  
facile ἐκδόντων in οὐδὲν, ut spatium conservaretur, mutari  
poterat. Itaque...ἐκδόντων ἐπιγέγραπτον.
- 402 ἀνυστοπμήσου Om. D. Coni. Thackeray (ὅκ) ἀνυστοπμήσου . Quod  
sensum meliorem reddit, quo sine hac conjectura sententia caret.

## Ant. XVII.

- 3 τῶνδε αὐτὸν ἀρεῶντων ἀρτί . Talibus enim mali loquitis cum induxerat D. Confer Ant. XVII. 123 κινέσθου δὲ ποῦτο σὺ ποῦτον ἔχου , ubi D pro κινέσθου "incitabantur" habet. Translatio illa meliorem sensum praebere videtur:— τῶνδε αὐτὸν κινέσθου διαβολῆς . Nam hic saltem, Lat. cod. Graec. antiquiorem et meliorem reddere videtur.
- 6 ἀρὸ πάντων δὲ ..... ἐπιμελητὴν <γ> ὑπάρχει τῇ ἐλπίδι . Ante omnes autem saturnium qui tunc curam siriae gerebat, inducere magna spe incitabatur D. Sententiam aliter punctam habet D, quae plus quam praesentes graec. codd. valet :— ἀρὸ πάντων δὲ ..... ἐπιμελητὴν , <γ> ὑπάρχει [τ]ῇ ἐλπίδι κτλ.
- 91 οἱ ἐλγύθει in tuae mala devenerit manifeste conuolvens D. Desiderant graec. codd. vocabulum quod suppleat sensum οἱ ἐλγύθει. Retinet D in "mala" sensum desideratum. Unde ex D, conijciendum est κικῶν , quod ex similitudine κικανῶν errore omitti poterat. Itaque οἱ ἐλγύθει <κικῶν>.
- 108 ἀπαλείψαι naturaeque iura reliquisse D. Auctore D, conijci potest pro ἀπαλείψαι , ἀπαλείψιν , quia ἀπαλείψαι inusitatum verbum videtur, cum de δικαιοσύνη agitur. Itaque ἀπαλείψιν.
- 132 καὶ κομισθέντος , πῶν... ὅθεν . Et adductus quidam eorum qui fuerant morte dampnati, bibit iubente varo D. Genitivus "absolutus" in uno verbo positus apud Josephum raro invenitur. Quo magis valet translatio loci in D :— καὶ κομισθὲς πῶν ἀπὸ θανάτου τῆς ἐλπιότων πύγῃ κειμένους ὅθεν κτλ.
- 134 κινδυνῶ . periclitabor D. Confer Ant. XVII. 139 κινδυνῶ . Retinet D futurum tempus, quod facit clausula εἰ γινώσκῃν , ut tempora inter se congruant. Verisimile igitur est κινδυνῶ .
- 134 ὡς δύο σῆκων a duobus domesticis D. Omnino non paruit graeca lingua "absolutas" constructiones pro "concretis". Et habent codd. graec. ἅμ σῆκων , quod Lat. habuisse videtur. Legendum est igitur σῆκων.
- 150 διὰ τὴν τέλει αὐτῶν . Etenim propter eius praesumptionem D. In 150, mentio fit rerum a Herode gestarum. Itaque haud absurda coniectura quam D suggerit αὐτῷ , pro αὐτῶν .
- 205 εἰς ἕρπον οὐμίας . sed in omnibus eod placabat D. Corrupti plerumque graec. codd, et varie emendati. Habuisse videtur eodem



ex quo Lat. facta est, ἀνεπαλίκοτο ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἀνδρῶν, ὡς ἀπὸς  
τὰ πάντα.

306 ἀπεχρήμα . iniuste D. Haud ad rem scriptum videtur vocabulum  
ἀπεχρήμα vim meliorem habet ἀπαόμυς ex D, et formam non ab  
ἀπεχρήμα diversam habet. Itaque ἀπαόμυς.

313 ὡς δ' οὐχ ὡς aliis ex regis persona loquentibus, aliis autem ex  
illius quidem sententia velut ex sua mente nonentibus D. Neque  
completa, neque perfecta clausula ὡς δ' οὐχ ὡς videtur, quia  
desideratur clausula cum μὴ, <sup>quae</sup> ~~quod~~ ad ὡς respondeat. Unde a  
priori verisimile est excidisse aliqua vocabula. Supplet  
peropportune lacunas D, qui habuisse videtur ὡς δ' οὐχ ὡς  
ἰσχυρὸς ἀνδρῶν, ὡς δ' οὐχ ὡς ... ἀπαόμυς ὡς ἔστι.

314 μῆτιν αὐτοῦ expetere cibum D. Suggestit Lat. graec. codd.  
olim αἶμα habuisse. Quam emendationem confirmat loci sensus, et  
quod in eadem sententia mentio fit de τρεφῆς.

318 ὡς μῆτι τοῦ ἀρετῆς δικαίου et odio magis quam natura iustitiae D.  
Emendavit Hudson codd. ὡς, legendo μῆτι, ex Lat. Melius autem  
fortasse est anho, id est μῆτι et φῆτι, auctore D, et  
approbante loci sensu, legere. Itaque καὶ μῆτι (μῆτιν) ἢ φῆτι /  
τοῦ ἀρετῆς δικαίου . Difficilis quidem sententia, sed ab complexo  
huius libri stylo omnino non abhorret.

## Ant. XVIII.

- 1 τὸ τ' ἄλλ' ἀξιώματι μέγας σὺν ὀλίγοις, ἐν ἑστέῃς ἀφ' αὐτοῦ. et in cunctis aliis  
dignitatibus clarus, cum paucis venit ad sirion D. Non de  
vocalibus insis hic agitur, sed de puncto quod in Haler post  
ὀλίγοις invenitur. Omittendum post ὀλίγοις comma, et σὺν ὀλίγοις  
cum ἀφ' αὐτοῦ coniungendum transferendi causa. μέγας σὺν ὀλίγοις  
simul coniuncta rectum sensum non praebent.
- 40 τὸ μὲν ἀρώπων ..... ἀρτίοντος χρέους . pro concubina utebatur, castus  
mira pulchritudine mulieris. Procedente vero tempore D. Suggestit  
D, δε post κατακλιθεὶς transponendum esse iuxta ἀρτίοντος et χρέους.  
Itaque fit κατακλιθεὶς \* clausula post verbum ἐχρήτο, quae ex more  
Josephi "pendere" solet. Legendum est ἐχρήτο κατακλιθεὶς τῷ πατρὶ  
τῆς εὐμορφίας, ἀρτίοντος (δε) χρέους κτλ.
- 60 σὶ δ' οὐκ ἠγάπων . sed iudaei non libenter accipiunt, et circa  
eos qui operabantur multa milia hominum congregata clamabant ut ab  
illo opere cessaretur D. Suggestit D, graece versus, melius  
fortasse punctam sententiam :- σὶ δ' οὐκ ἠγάπων, καὶ τοῖς ἀμφοῖν τὸ  
ὅπως ἐργαζομένων, πολλὰ τε μυριάδες ἀνθρώπων συνελθόντες καταβάντων  
αὐτοῦ αὐσάσθαι τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἀρεθισμῶν.
- 63 ὁ Χριστὸς σῆτος ἦν . Christus hic erat D. Excidit aliquid ex hac  
clausula, sed fieri non potest ut tota corrupta sit, quia  
Χριστιανῶν (64) inutile et ineptum sic fieret. Cum apud Josephum,  
circa viginti homines sint nomine Jesus, verisimile est interisse  
aliquid quod olim hunc Jesum distinguebat. Confer Ant. XX. 200  
τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ Hic etiam conjici  
potest ὁ Χριστὸς (λεγομένου) σῆτος ἦν.
- 67 ἐν ἀξιώματι μεγάλῃ καὶ μέγιστος ὕψους ..... ἐφ' ἑαυτὸ μέγαλον et dignitate  
magna sullimis, idoneus etiam ad munera largienda sumptusque  
faciendos. Nam memoratae quoque mulieri maiora dona promiserat.  
Quae illa contempnente maximo fuerat amore succensus D.  
Longiorem versionem praebet D, sed graec. codd. plerumque haud necesse  
sufficiunt. Excidit fortasse aliquid post μεγάλῃ, quod in  
Lat. retinetur, non tamen ad graec. codd. reddi iam potest. Itaque  
μεγάλῃ \*

- 113 (καὶ γὰρ ἤλθον ἐπὶ πλείον τῇ ἀγοάστῃ τῶν Ἀγίων ) atque ad audiendum cum per plurima multitudo concurreret D. Haud satis τῇ ἀγοάστῃ per se. Suggestit D, quod idoneum est Josepho ideoque verisimile, καὶ ~~ἐπὶ~~ συγχέοντες πλείοντες ἐπὶ τῇ ἀγοάστῃ τῶν λόγων.
- 131 Τίμιος honorabilis vir cyprianus D. Lat. codd. apud Niese habent 'honorabilis vir cyprus' Dubium nomen Τίμιος, et auctore D, ut adjectivum reddi potest. Itaque τίμιός τις κύριος κτλ.
- 162 ἐπὶ καὶ χεῖρυν ἀποσημαίνων inter alia quoque gaudere significans illum ad se sospitem repedare. Cumque ille ad capreas advenisset D. Haud sani hoc loco praec. codd., quod secundum eos gaudebat Tiberius quod re vera venerat. Tum-quod haud expectandum est-invenitur οὐδ' ἀφικεῖται. Difficultatem solvit D, nam sententiam aliter punctam habet :- ἐπὶ καὶ χεῖρυν ἀποσημαίνων ἐπὶ τῷ τῶν ἰανήκων, [sc. εἰς Ποπύλιν 161] εἰς τὰς καρέας (δ') οὐδ' ἀφικνεῖται κτλ.
- 192 ἡγωνία unde quoque anxius factus praeter decus et dignitatem cuncta respicere D. ἡγωνία E. Confirmat ipsa sententia :- καὶ οὐκ ἔμελλεν ..... ἡγῆσθαι ..... τὸ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, et praecipue D lectionem cod. E ἡγωνία.
- 193 καὶ οὐκ ἐφύλατο [ταῦτ' ἑαυτῶν, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ ἡμάρταν] neque haec dicens mentitus est, sed vicissitudinem ei meritam reddidit D. Om. codd. MWE ταῦτ'... ἡμάρταν, retinent A et Lat. Haud a Josephi stylo abhorrent vocabula, et gravi auctoritate fulciuntur. Itaque fortasse legendum est καὶ οὐκ ἐφύλατο ταῦτ' ἑαυτῶν, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ ἡμάρταν.
- 223 παντὶς ἀνθρώπου τῆς ἐκείνου. Om. D haec vocabula. Flagitat loci sensus, praecipue ex οὐ μὲν ἀδελφὸς εἶναι, καὶ ἀδελφός τις τῆς παντὶς. Melius igitur fortasse ἀνθρώπου τῆς ἐκείνου καὶ ἀδελφός τις / κτλ.
- 223 μετ' οὗ τοῦ κατωτάτου Add. D post τελευτῇ, 'sed haec postea tunc autem tiberius'. Videtur igitur habuisse codex ex quo Lat. translata est :- καὶ οὕτως μὲν ὕστερον, Τιβέριος δὲ τότε, et meliorem sensum adhibet, quod μὲν cum δὲ, in Τιβέριος δὲ, respondet. Itaque fortasse μετ' οὗ τοῦ κατωτάτου. (καὶ οὕτως μὲν ὕστερον,) (224) Τιβέριος δὲ τότε κτλ.



- 270 γωσμίων ad tiberiadem undique confluentes D. Suggestit igitur D aut μυριάδες .... γωσμίονι , aut μυριάδες ..... γωσμίωσι . (Conf. Ant. XVIII. 60 πολλὰ τε μυριάδες ἀνθρώπων συνελθόντες ). Iam dictum est (269) Petronium ad tiberiadem iter facere. Itaque facile γωσμίωσι in γωσμίον mutari poterat, et difficiliore lectione praestante legendum est. γωσμίωσι .
- 274 γράφειν ἑρὸς Γάιον τὸ ἀνύκτεστον significans immobilem animum D. Apud Josephum quidem, non solet accusativus casus γράφειν sequi. Confer Ant. XVIII. 281, ubi διασφῶν invenitur. Auctore D, conjici potest γράφειν ἑρὸς Γάιον τὸ ἀνύκτεστον οὕτων (διασφῶν τε γὰρ τὸ πρὸς τὴν ὑποδοχὴν κτλ. Ἀγρίππᾳ τὴν ἀρχὴν θαυμάσας ..... τὴν δὲ κτήσαν ἀρετὴν ) mox vero virtutem agrippae miratus, quod suum regnum non redditibus non pecuniis D. Inepte τὴν ἀρχὴν θαυμάσας ..... τὴν δὲ κτήσαν ἀρετὴν , quia non redditibus augeri virtus solet, sed magis regnum. Itaque, ex D, secundum Niese transponenda ἀρετὴν et ἀρχὴν . Inseriri potest etiam (ἐν τούτῳ) pro (ἐπιθυμίας) , ut (ἐν τούτῳ) cum ἐν τούτῳ infra respondeat.
- 354 τῶν ἀλκίτων πρὸς ὧν ἡλικία sed etiam aetate ferventium non minimam manum D. Non recte graec. codd. Coni. Niese τῶν δαμνῶν . D suggerit πρὸς ἀλκίτους τῶν ὧν ἡλικία
- 357 εἰς τὴν ὕλην ad locum proprium D. non antea ὕλη mentio fit, et vocabulum dubium videtur. Confer autem Ant. XVIII. 363 εἰς τὰς εἰλεσι , ubi D etiam habet "in locis suis". Meliorem igitur sensum -- et auctoritatem meliorem quam εἰς τὴν ὕλην praebet εἰς τὸ εἶος .



- ἢς ἀριφύτος . Multo melius conjici potest ex D *μυμνησμένον* .  
 250 ὡ ἀδύμονία contraria erant vota senatus et populi, multo magis  
 autem D. Suggestit D sententiam aliter meliusque fortasse punctam,  
 et confirmat pro ὡ ἀδύμονία, ἐναντία, quod codd. M E habent.  
 Itaque :- ὡςτε τῷ δήμῳ ἐναντία τὰ τῶν συγκλητικῶν ἦν, ὡς δὲ  
 ἀπετίαν μὴ κτλ.  
 337 ἐπέμψε . Emisit D. Desiderat praepositionem ἐντρυφί. Niese  
 εἰσέμψε habet, cod. E ἐντρυμψε . Suggestit D ἐφέμψε .



THE TESTIMONIUM FLAVIANUM.

One of the main reasons for the works of Josephus in Whiston's English translation, and a Bible forming the almost indispensable nucleus of every family library, may very probably be that, while covering much of the ground, and indeed in parts using the 'Bible' as its source, the works of Josephus also contain a reference to Jesus Christ. The passage occurs in Ant. XVIII. 63, 64 :-

"Now about this time lived Jesus, a wise man, if indeed it be lawful to call him a man. For he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of men who receive the truth with pleasure, and drew over to him many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was <sup><Jesus> called</sup> ~~the~~ Christ. And when Pilate, at the information of the leading men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those who had <sup>advised</sup> ~~loved~~ him at first did not cease to do so. For he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets foretold this and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And the <sup>race</sup> ~~tribe~~ of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct to this day."<sup>2</sup>

First as to the context of the passage with regard to the rest of the book. In the third chapter, Josephus, recounting events during the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate in Judaea, gives an account of Pilate's attempt to introduce into Jerusalem the images of the Emperor Tiberius. <sup>As he knew</sup> ~~(Knowing)~~ the customs and feelings of the Jews, this was, to say the least, an ill-considered measure, with which he did not proceed any further on seeing <sup>their</sup> ~~(the)~~ obstinate determination. ~~(of the Jews)~~ Next comes the account of another insurrection arising from popular discontent at Pilate's measures for providing the city with an adequate water-supply out of the "sacred money". The justification of the outbreak is here more difficult to see considering the bad water-supply hitherto available: it was

by Hackerau: 'Josephus, the man and the historian'. p. 3. <sup>2</sup> Skilleto, with alterations.

suppressed by disguising Roman soldiers as Jews and ordering them to act like typical Jewish "Sicarii". Then comes the Testimonium, followed by an account of the scandal in the Temple of Isis at Rome and the banishment of Jews from Rome by Tiberius.<sup>3</sup>

This then is the famous Testimonium. Short as it is, the debate about it has been heated and long: the sixteenth century saw men like Van Giffen, Osiander, and Scaliger, suspecting its genuineness, and the debate is still proceeding, inclining now this way, now that, according as now one, now another throws in his lot for or against. If authentic, this is the earliest mention from a non-Christian source that we possess, of Jesus Christ. In the "Jewish War" there is no mention, but there the nature of the subject precludes any reasonable possibility of it. As a natural consequence, the dispute has at times tended to be taken as a bulwark by which Christianity stands or falls: the most notable example recently in this connection is the work of Eisler.<sup>4</sup> "Discredit the Gospels, disprove to one's own satisfaction the authenticity of the Testimonium, and Christianity is disproved". - Such appears to be an underlying assumption. Christianity, however, does not depend entirely on Josephus for its validity - if genuine, the Testimonium, at best, only gives extra external evidence of it.

The evidence may be divided into two parts, external and internal. To take the external first, it is to be noted that the passage occurs in all the existing manuscripts of Josephus, both Greek and Latin, which contain the eighteenth book of the "Antiquities". One thing is certain, that the manuscripts do not give any opportunity for dispute, some having one version, others another. All the manuscripts of Josephus, however, are of comparatively late date, Codex Parisinus and Codex Ambrosianus being the oldest. Of these the former is of the tenth century,

<sup>3</sup> cf. Suet. Tib. 36, also. <sup>4</sup> Dr. R. Eisler. "The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist"; Eng. Trans. (London 1929).



but contains only the first ten books of the "Antiquities", and so is useless for the present purpose: the latter is of the eleventh century and is the oldest Greek manuscript existing which has the passage. The Latin manuscripts are later still, some belonging to the fourteenth century. This manuscript consensus is by no means to be disregarded in spite of their late date. If such agreement could be found in all the manuscripts of other authors, there would perhaps be little doubt entertained: but the particular circumstances of the present case have to be taken into account.

The passage is actually first quoted by Eusebius<sup>5</sup> (fl. circa 315 A.D.) in the form in which we now possess it, and later by Ambrose (c. 360), Hieronymus (c. 400 A.D.), Isodorus (c. 410 A.D.), Pelusiota (c. 440 A.D.), Cassiodorus (c. 510 A.D.) and others.<sup>6</sup> Such information would at first sight appear to be conclusive, but it is far from being so. There is no actual quotation of it earlier than Eusebius, and it might be expected that the early Christians would have eagerly seized upon this passage of Josephus if they knew it. Eusebius wrote after Constantine's Milan Edict of Toleration in 312 A.D., when a Christian censorship was also instituted of all heretical literature: these considerations may be taken to indicate possible Christian interpolation. This line of argument is one "from silence", and the merits of this type of reasoning have not to be disregarded. Not only, however, is there a silence, but Origen (fl. circa 230 A.D.) says in two places, that Josephus did not "admit that our Jesus was the Christ",<sup>7</sup> and that he "did not believe in Jesus as the Christ".<sup>8</sup> Small wonder then, that the favourable allusion to James, the brother of Jesus, seems so inconsistent to him as to deserve mention. But he also says that Josephus makes the murder of James the cause of the fall of Jerusalem, and takes the opportunity of inserting his personal conviction that the

<sup>5</sup> Eus. Hist. Eccl. i. 11: Dem. Evang. iii. 5. 105. <sup>6</sup> W. Whiston, Works of Fl. Josephus, Dissertation I, gives a full list of authors. <sup>7</sup> Origen. Com. in Matth. tom x. c. 17.

<sup>8</sup> Origen. Contra Celsus. i. 47.



Crucifixion of Jesus was the cause. Yet, the passage on James (Ant.XVIII. 197 - 203.) generally admitted to be favourable to him makes no such statement, nor is it to be found in any part of Josephus' works. But the writer of the Chronicon Pascale<sup>9</sup> has a similar statement also to that of Origen. Some have detected in this, evidence of further tampering with the text of Josephus. It is known, however, that Hegesippos<sup>10</sup> narrates that James was thrown down from the Temple roof and then finally dispatched by a fuller, and immediately afterwards Vespasian laid siege to Jerusalem. Klausner<sup>11</sup> believes therefore that the mistake is due to Origen's confusion of Hegesippos with Josephus, the forms in Hebrew being identical: indeed, in the Latin versions of Josephus, the forms Iosippus, Hegesippos and Egessippus are found. To say the least, this theory has as much evidence, and equal intrinsic probability as the theory of tampering with the text of Josephus in this place as well.

Many have noted the quotation of the Testimonium in Eusebius, and the statements in Origen, and immediately assumed that the Testimonium is not genuine. This is going farther than the evidence permits. All that Origen says is that Josephus did not accept Jesus as the Christ. How then did Origen know this of Josephus? If it was because his Josephus text had no mention of Jesus whatsoever, then Origen has made a very dangerous use of the argumentum e silentio - "Josephus does not mention Jesus, therefore he disbelieved in Him as the Christ". Rather do the passages in Origen assume some mention of Jesus by Josephus. To say with Origen that Josephus disbelieved in the Messiahship of Jesus does not prove that he did not mention Him, any more than Josephus' obvious disbelief in the alleged Messiahship of e.g. Theudas

<sup>9</sup> I. 463. <sup>10</sup> ap. Eus. H.E. II. 23. "Jesus of Nazareth". Dr. Klausner, vs. 'Testimonium

proves that he never mentioned them. It would be correct to say that Josephus did not believe in Theudas as the Messiah; it would not be correct to infer that Josephus never mentions him. The most that the passages in Origen can do, therefore, is to cause us to say that the words "He was the Christ" did not occur in Origen's text of Josephus in any shape or form.

Turning to the internal evidence, we find that the position of the Testimonium in the text is often used by its opponents to prove that the whole passage is entirely interpolated. The passage comes in the midst of an account of the various "tumults" which arose during the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate in Judaea. Firstly, there is the incident of the proposed introduction of the Emperor Tiberius' standards into Jerusalem and the consequent tumult.<sup>12</sup> Secondly, the unrest as a result of Pilate's construction of an aqueduct and the use of Temple money for it.<sup>13</sup> Then the Testimonium comes.<sup>14</sup> Next appears the scandal of the Isis-Temple worship in Rome and the expulsion of the Jews from Rome by Tiberius.<sup>15</sup> A Samaritan false-prophet is the cause of the next tumult. Norden<sup>16</sup> saw that the Testimonium does not fit in well with these four "disturbances", (the same Greek noun or verb occurs in the account of each<sup>17</sup>) and therefore rejected the whole passage as an interpolation. Such an argument would be entirely unanswerable were it not for its assumption that Josephus was a very careful writer, diligently inserting events into a logically planned scheme. For such a view of Josephus as a historian the evidence is lacking: his accounts of Herod at the end of the sixteenth book of the *Antiquities* make it probable that the passage containing the unfavourable view of Herod was inserted at a later date, when the death of Agrippa II had made such an action

<sup>12</sup> *Ant.* xviii. 55-59. <sup>13</sup> *Ant.* xviii. 60-62. <sup>14</sup> *Ant.* xviii. 63-64. <sup>15</sup> *Ant.* xviii. 65-84.

<sup>16</sup> *Neue Lehrbücher f. d. klass. Altertum*. vol. xxx. pp. 637 ff. (1913). <sup>17</sup> *ἀσέβεια, ἀσεβεία*.



less dangerous: the unequal division of space also given to one subject to the exclusion of another (e.g. on the death of Gaius and the accession of Claudius)<sup>18</sup> suggests that the author had no logical outline and scheme of his composition. Consequently, it would not be at all unnatural for "Josephus" to insert a passage about Jesus Christ in the midst of the account of the "disturbances". It looks very much as though the account of the disturbances follows a source, the course of which was broken into by "Josephus". No one can deny that the death of Jesus did cause a disturbance, and may therefore with good reason have been inserted by "Josephus" as a supplement to the source he was using.

The style is another consideration which may go far to deciding the genuineness or otherwise of the passage. *But the late Dr.* Thackeray<sup>19</sup> has elaborated the theory that two distinct "assistants" can be seen at work in Ant. XV - XX: the "Sophoclean" imitator in Ant. XV and XVI, so called because of his affectation of Sophoclean forms and vocabulary, and the "Thucydidean hack" of Ant. XVII - XIX. For the assumption of the latter there seems to be ~~some~~ *very slender* ~~(slight)~~ *but if the theory were true,* evidence. ~~(so that)~~ *would* the passage in Ant. XVIII. 63 and 64 ~~(may)~~ not in any case have been written actually by Josephus himself, even if entirely genuine. Dupin,<sup>20</sup> speaking of the objections to the authenticity of the Testimonium, quotes its opponents as saying a propos of the style - "loci illius stylum perplexum esse, male fluentem et a Josephi stylo eleganti et ornato varium". The evidence that Josephus' style in the Antiquities is either "elegans" or "ornatus" does not seem very conclusive. Most authorities agree, however, that the words and phrases in the Testimonium are of the type which Josephus uses: the use of τε alone, for example, as a connecting particle in the last sentence is entirely characteristic

<sup>18</sup> Ant. XIX. <sup>19</sup> op. cit. pp. 100-204 <sup>20</sup> Nova Bibliotheca Antiquarum Ecclesiarum, 1692. p. 37.



of Josephus. So far then, considerations have been brought forward proving, so far as proof is possible in the circumstances, that the Testimonium is not a total interpolation, as Schurer claimed. But the quotations from Eusebius and Origen also suggest that the text has not always been the same, and may have been tampered with. It is necessary, therefore, to discover what parts of the Testimonium are entirely genuine, what parts are spurious, and what parts show that deletions have taken place.

*γίνεται* The first word presents considerable difficulty: the Latin version has "fuit", which also occurs in Jerome's quotation of the passage.<sup>21</sup> Eisler<sup>22</sup> points out that cannot mean "there lived" as frequently translated (e.g. by Whiston - Shilleto, Thackeray) or "was" (Schürer), but it is frequently used at the beginning of sentences in which disturbances or revolts or seditions are being recounted.<sup>23</sup> His suggestion that originally the text read *γίνεται μὲν ἀρχὴ θόρυβου, καὶ Ἰησοῦς* is supported by the fact that Josephus is recounting *θόρυβον* in this book, (some, e.g. Norden, have unjustly inferred that, because *θόρυβος* is not found in this passage, the whole Testimonium is spurious.) and is therefore very probable. Thus the Christian censor has deleted *ἀρχὴ θόρυβου*, leaving merely *γίνεται Ἰησοῦς*. Some MSS. of Eusebius have *Ἰησοῦς τις*, and this contemptuous particle may well have been in the original, but later removed.

*ἀνέ*. *ἀνέ* at least looks genuine, being defended by *ἐν γὰρ ἀνδράσιν*: if *ἀνέ* was not genuine, the next clause would lose its point entirely. *ἀνέ* is here used we can infer, as the opposite of *θεός*: such a use is found only in Homer<sup>24</sup> and Herodotus: *ἀνθρωπος* is technically correct. So the use of *ἀνέ* in this context is peculiar, but this is hardly sufficient to prove it spurious, considering the fact firstly,

<sup>21</sup> *De Viris Illustribus*: cap. xiii. <sup>22</sup> *op. cit.* p. 50 <sup>23</sup> e.g. B. J. I. 99, 85, 236, 648; Ant. xviii.

310; x. 306; xx. 57, 118, 173. <sup>24</sup> e.g. *Il.* 19. 96. *Ζεὺς ἀνδρῶν ἀνδρῶν ἡδὲ θεῶν*.





Ant. XVIII., and may therefore be taken as genuine.

ἰαληθῆ can only come from a Christian interpolator: in view of a similar confusion in Plutarch (Cato Minor. 59. 35. δι' ἰαληθείαν for δι' ἰαθείαν, and B.J. VI. 403 - ἰαληθῶς or ἰαθεῶς, <sup>which is</sup> the conjecture of Heinichen, ἰαθεῶς is plausible.

καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ἰουδαίους ἀπαιτοῦς δεῖ καὶ τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ ὑαγιάγγο : <sup>29.</sup>

this phrase has no evident sign of corruption. Eisler claims

even to find a parallel to it in Ant. XVII. 327. ὑαγιάγγο is

the reading of Naber; ὑαγιάγγο of Niese. Naber does not

mention any authority for this in his Adnotatio Critica: and

Niese does not note any manuscript variant. It looks like a

conjecture by Naber, to give the innuendo of leading astray (ὑπό),

but it is not necessary.

καὶ αὐτὸν . . . ὑαγιάγγοις

In this sentence οὐκ ὑαγιάγγοις gives rise first to difficulty:

the words do not seem complete. It is interesting to note that

Jerome has the absolute "perseveraverunt" in his version: to

understand ὑαγιάγγοις from ὑαγιάγγοις which forms the subject,

is awkward, and οὐκ ὑαγιάγγοις alone cannot mean οὐκ ὑαγιάγγοις .

Eisler has justly inferred that something has here been deleted.

<sup>30.</sup>  
L. Van Liempt gives most of the references to ὑαγιάγγοις in Josephus, and proves that, as a rule, he did not follow the classical use of

29. op. cit. page. 544.

30. "Hermosyne". LV. pages. 109-116. "De Flaviano Testimonio".



ἀγαθύνω - "be content with". From the references we see:-

(a) Josephus uses ἀγαθύνω of God: Ant. I. 75. (I.99) ὁ Θεὸς ἀγαθήσει τοὺς πάντας (Noah.) - LXX. Gen. 6. 9. Νῶε δι' ἠρεμίας αἰώνος ἀγαθήσει τὸν Θεόν.

(b) Of a human father, e.g. Ant. V. 350 - of Eli and his sons:

XIV. 170 - of <sup>Hyrcaanus</sup> Herod, ἀγαθύνει τὸν υἱόν ἑαυτοῦ.

(c) Of husband to wife, e.g. Ant. IV. 249. ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀγαθώτερας

αἰῶς γυναικὸς - with additional sense of "prefer". cf. V. 342:

XI. 339 πολλοὶ τὴν οὖν εὐπῶ σιγασθέν ἀγαθήσαν.

(d) Of friends: of Jonathan and David, Ant. VI. 206: Ant. VI. 317,

ἀγαθήσαν as a synonym for σιγασθέν : Vita 198 φίλων and ἀγαθύν

are synonymous.

(e) Of a superior to his subordinate: Ant. XII. 166, 173.

(f) Of the Pharisees towards their disciple Hyrcanus. Ant. XIII. 289.

Thus, Josephus does not use ἀγαθύνω in its strictly classical sense, nor in the specifically Christian sense which ἀγαπή has in the Pauline Epistles. The passages suggest that the meaning is "admire", "like".

There is no need to reject ἀγαθήσαντες here, with Norden, as being used in the Christian sense: the examples show that the word is

Josephan, (and means "admire", "like") Εἰς τὸν

31.

Eisler also says that σιωπῶν ἐπισημαστικὸς ἡλικίου looks

very much like ~~(a translation of)~~ "per Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus". (Tac. Annals. XV.) Whether or not Josephus <sup>was</sup> copied <sup>by</sup> Tacitus is questionable; but such a mention of the Crucifixion may very likely have been in the official records which Josephus used as his source for this account of Pilate's procuratorship, and introduced by Josephus here.

ἐφάνη ..... ἐργασίων . Here the difficulty is τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν, which is not characteristic of Josephus: the alleged parallels, especially in Ant. VII. II - ἡδὲ δ' αὖτις δύο ἡμέρας ἔχων ἐν τῇ Σικελίᾳ (Naber.) - Σικελίᾳ Thackeray; Σικελίᾳ Eisler - are not real parallels. The whole passage ἐφάνη ..... ἐργασίων looks corrupt, and is fairly certainly a Christian interpolation on the Resurrection. To defend the reference to the prophets τῶν θείων ... ἐργασίων, as do Eisler and Thackeray, by saying that Josephus is putting the Christian statements into virtual Oratio Obliqua, and thus letting the Christians speak for themselves, is very weak.

ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν

This is the most crucial clause in the passage. It has been claimed to be entirely a gloss. At any rate, it is improbable that Josephus could have written these words without thus admitting the Messiahship of Jesus: as it is now, therefore, the statement is not truly "Josephan". Origen surely would not have said that Josephus disbelieved in Jesus as the Christ, if these words were in his text exactly as we now have them. <sup>32</sup> Eisler rightly says that something has been deleted from them. Possibly λεγόμενος so common with names, was first written, and then deleted by a censor who thought it sounded sceptical. Thackeray <sup>33</sup> says that there are "no fewer than 20 persons bearing the name of Jesus mentioned in Josephus". What more natural then that Josephus, when he wrote of this one, should

<sup>32</sup> p. cit. p. 54. <sup>33</sup> p. 146, op. cit.

distinguish him thus: - ὁ Χριστὸς λεγόμενος (sc. Ἰησοῦς) ὑπὸς ἡμῶν  
(cf. Act. xx. 200.) This adds more point to the ὁ, which causes  
difficulty without λεγόμενος. Jerome's "credebatur  
esse" has sometimes been taken to mean that ἡμῶν ἦν  
was once in the text. If we could be sure that all Latin  
translations translated word for word literally, this theory  
would be plausible. But Latin has different idioms and  
syntax from Greek, which would make it difficult, and  
moreover early translators interpreted passages in their  
translations, taking into account the context: which is  
what Jerome has done here.

εἰς τὸν περὶ νῦν.....φύλον.

A telling argument for the existence of ὁ Χριστὸς in the  
sentence above is Χριστιανῶν in this sentence: without  
Χριστὸς there would be no point whatsoever in Χριστιανῶν.

φύλον is the word which would be used by anyone speaking  
contemptuously, and is for this reason genuine. The  
accumulation of particles has been criticised here. The  
use of τε alone is certainly Josephan; otherwise the  
manuscripts differ - εἰς τε is supported by A, W, and the  
Excerpta, and is also found in Erasmus' text.

We have thus stripped the text of what seem manifest  
interpolations, and indicated where words have possibly been  
deleted. Bearing these in mind our "revised" text has to  
be tested by asking whether with these modifications Origen  
was justified in referring to Josephus as an unbeliever.  
The whole tone of the passage is one of contempt: its context,  
in the midst of the account of "disturbances"; the probable  
emendations λεγόμενος and ταχὺ - all imply contempt.  
And in the last words οὐκ ᾔσχετο τὸ φύλον, we can almost  
hear the writer, as Thackeray says, <sup>34</sup> saying "unfortunately".  
Origen was quite justified in thus referring to Josephus,  
who was himself a Jewish priest, and a Pharisee, and a  
Hasmonean, and in whose eyes Christians would be schismatics.



The passage as originally written by 'Josephus' probably ran as follows:-

γίνεσθαι δὲ καὶ ποῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς (ἀρχὴ θουρύβου), σοφιστὴς ἀνὴρ, εἰς γὰρ ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν κρή. ἦν γὰρ ἀρετῶν ἔργων ἀσκητὴς, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡδύα τὰς θῆ δεικνύων. καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἑλληνικοὺς ἐκείνην ἔπειθε. ὁ Χριστὸς λεγόμενος οὗτος ἦν. καὶ αὐτὸν ἠδυνάμει τῶν ἀρετῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀεὶ ἡμῶν σταθερῶς ἐκτελεστικὸς Πλάτων, οὐκ ἐκείνην - - -  
 - - - οἱ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκείνην ἔπειθε. ὡς πρὸς τὸν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε ἀπομαρτυροῦν οὐκ ἐπέλεξε τὸν φῶλον

We have thus evidence for and against the authenticity of the Testimonium, and finally the view of partial interpolation, which seems most worthy of support. The Slavonic version discovered comparatively recently does not give the assistance which everyone naturally hoped for : there seems no shadow of doubt that the Slavonic version Testimonium is the "Josephan" one, still further interpolated. The problem is thus made doubly difficult. Admittedly upholders of such a middle view are open to attack by the two other sides on the grounds of refusing to commit themselves definitely either one way, or the other. Unfortunately the evidence does not allow of any such definite commitment, and it is not reasonable to draw conclusions which the evidence does not allow. It is better, however reluctantly, to admit partial defeat, than to claim an unqualified success for which there are few real grounds.

Authorities are still divided. <sup>35</sup> Ewald, <sup>36</sup> Edersheim, <sup>37</sup> Jack, <sup>38</sup> Klausner and Thackeray support the partial interpolation view. ("Josephus, the Man and the Historian" contains this view: before, Thackeray believed it was a total interpolation.) <sup>39</sup> Burkitt, <sup>40</sup> Barnes, and Harnack <sup>41</sup> believe it authentic. Laqueur's view in *Der jüd. Historiker*, <sup>35</sup> *History of Israel*, Eng. Trans. <sup>36</sup> *art. Smith's Dict. of Christian Biography*. <sup>37</sup> *The Historic Christ*. Clark, 1933. <sup>38</sup> *Jesus of Nazareth*. <sup>39</sup> *Theol. Tijdschrift*. Leiden. 1913, pp. 135-74. <sup>40</sup> *The Testimony of Josephus to Jesus Christ*. S. P. C. K. 1920. <sup>41</sup> *Internat. Monatschrift für Wissenschaft und Technik* 1913, pp. 1037-44.

31. Jos. pp. 274 ff., is that the publication of Justus' "Jewish War" so endangered the popularity of Josephus' works, that Josephus, seeing that the Septuagint was taken by the Christians as sacred, and therefore was being preserved, thought that the Antiquities would be preserved "wenn sie in das Christentum übergeführt<sup>wurde</sup>". Thus, the arch-traitor, having no scruples, inserted the Testimonium and saved his Antiquities. It looks as though Laqueur, <sup>knowing</sup> ~~(having noticed)~~ the course of history has assumed that Josephus was able to forecast it thus correctly and acted accordingly! Josephus does not seem to have had such far-reaching aims and ideals. So vexed is the whole question, however, that even two authorities who ultimately reach a similar view disagree in details. Ewald<sup>42</sup> says "Josephus was handed down by the Christians, and therefore the possibility of interpolation was very grave"; Thackeray<sup>43</sup> says "it is illogical to argue as some critics appear to do, that the Christians preserved the historian's works largely on account of the so-called testimonium de Christo, and at the same time that they themselves have interpolated it". Here are two very contradictory statements, contradictory perhaps because the question at issue is the very one on which the whole much-debated problem hinges. Both authors admit, as indeed everyone must admit, that Josephus owes the preservation of his works to the Christians. It is when the question "Why?" is asked that the difficulties arise. The early Christians must have had some reason for their action. It may be because Josephus' "Antiquities" dealt with the period covered by the Old Testament, but that is hardly weighty enough. The most reasonable answer is that they had some particular interest in Josephus' works, and the particular interest which the early Christians had in any work was to know whether it contained a mention of

<sup>42</sup> "History of Israel". <sup>43</sup> op. cit. p. 130

44

"Jesus called Christ". The presumption is therefore that Josephus had something about Jesus Christ in his works. To say that the Christians first interpolated the whole of the Testimonium and preserved then the 'Antiquities' on that account makes the Testimonium one of the greatest frauds in the history of literature, and is very improbable in itself. Josephus then wrote something about Jesus in his original draft of the 'Antiquities', and changes were made in his version later, before the time of Eusebius, altering the contemptuous tone of Josephus himself, into a Christian one. Early scribes had not the ardent desire of the moderns to keep the 'ipsissima verba' of the text before them: but they adhered to the main sense of the passage in question. This is again the theory of partial interpolation to which an examination of the evidence, both external and internal, lends confirmation.

44 cf. the numerous *logia* which preceded the Gospels.



Josephus: the Man and the Historian.

A man is not necessarily a historian, but a historian is inevitably a human being, that is, he possesses the attributes and the feelings which go to constitute a man. It is therefore impossible to separate entirely the man and the historian, as if they were two distinct entities in one individual, because they are inter-connected and mutually supplementary: any such distinction is made purely for the sake of convenience in forming an estimate of the author of an historical work, but there is a danger of assuming without justification that what is a matter of convenience is a matter of fact.

An estimate of any historian must rest upon the basic fact that the historian is a man, and therefore the "man" and the "historian" can only be fully comprehended in the light of each other. Whether this should be so ideally, is a question not within the present scope: the fact must be conceded.

A study of Josephus the man is thus one of the means of arriving at an estimate of Josephus the historian. It involves the two problems; What is the most reasonable view to take of the character of Josephus, bearing in mind the numerous and diverse opinions which have been held of him?', and, 'To what extent did his character influence his history?'

When Josephus was only fourteen years of age, "the chief-priests and prominent men in the city"<sup>1</sup> used to consult him about the Law. He was then clever, and showed his talents early. As he became older, he still showed his ability. A man who was not clever and able could not have retained, let alone won, the honoured position which Josephus had at Rome, from the destruction of Jerusalem (70 A.D.) until his death (after 100 A.D.). An ability to rise and fulfil positions of trust has been characteristic of Jews throughout history: Josephus was in no respects an exception.

He had a taste for literature, which exhibited itself from youth.<sup>2</sup> The assiduous way in which Josephus must have turned his attention to Greek classics in order to improve his style and knowledge of the

<sup>1</sup> Vita 9 <sup>2</sup> Vita 9, τὸ φιλομαθές.

language is characteristic.<sup>3</sup> Behind his thoroughness there must have been at least a little appreciation of the literature he was studying. He was practically efficient: his careful choice of a sect, before finally joining himself with the Pharisees,<sup>4</sup> the successful embassy on which he went to Rome,<sup>5</sup> and his defence of Jotapata, (whatever view is taken of his motives) all go to confirm this.

Himself a priest, with royal Hasmonean blood in his veins, and conscious of his brilliance as a youth, he was tempted to let his ambition get the upper hand, and gave way to it. Hence, where his personal interests were at stake, he became unscrupulous, leading himself into inconsistencies. This seems to explain his career in Galilee. To say that the *Bellum Judaicum* account - that Josephus went as a *πρεσβυτος* - is right, as contrasted with the statement in the *Vita* that he went as one of three "ambassadors" is doubtful, considering that the *Vita* was occasioned by the "Jewish War" of his rival Justus, whose main purpose was to attack Josephus' conduct in Galilee. So Josephus covered up his re-statement of his position with a counter-attack upon Justus. Events point to the theory that Josephus did act as "general" in Galilee, but acted "ultra vires"; he was sent on a mission of pacification, at least for the moment, with two others,<sup>6</sup> and emerged fighting the Romans at Jotapata. His hands may have been forced a little, but that is not a complete explanation. Opposition from the Zealots, his own loosely-defined position as "ambassador", visions of himself successfully stemming the Roman advance - all these considerations probably contributed to his assuming a command which at the time was not officially his, and fighting with the Zealots whom he really hated against the Romans whom he really admired. The inconsistencies in Galilee are partly due to Josephus' own character, which was ambitious, and even, at times, unscrupulous.

Josephus was not a fanatic: the hatred which the Zealots nursed against him, and his long stay in Rome, are ample evidence of this. His religion did not identify itself with a narrow nationalism.

<sup>3</sup> Ant. x. 263. <sup>4</sup> *Vita* 10-12 <sup>5</sup> *Vita* 13-16 <sup>6</sup> *Vita* 29.



Although he was himself a priest, he was hardly what we should call religious; his life (so far as we can judge from his writings, was ~~(not)~~ <sup>essentially worldly</sup> ~~(exceptionally spiritual)~~ and was not characterized by <sup>the</sup> exceptional spiritual fervour of one in union with Jehovah, whom he worshipped.

In a word, pride sums up Josephus as a man, and was his ruling passion. He had much of which he could justly be proud, but he let himself at times be carried away by it. "A priest and a Hasmonean" is a phrase frequently found in his writings, and no doubt was frequently on his lips. And to a Hasmonean, Herodian was the direct antithesis: the House of Herod was, in Hasmonean eyes, only ~~half~~ Jew, mere Idumean converts. This imagined superiority was responsible for many of the domestic troubles between Herod and Mariamne, herself a Hasmonean, and it was partly responsible for Josephus' shortcomings. It led him to despise other people who were not so well-born or gifted as he himself was.

He was a Pharisee, and, after his first visit to Rome, returned with a lively admiration for the Romans; he did not object to Roman rule, provided the Jews were given liberty to practise their religion. But after Jotapata, where he was taken prisoner by the Romans, he was used as an interpreter and mediator in the siege of Jerusalem; and then he was looked upon as a traitor to his country, an unprincipled coward serving only his own personal interests. The attack of Jonathan<sup>7</sup> must have been typical of the hatred felt against him. And although, strictly, his being a Pharisee did not thereby prevent him from having pro-Roman sentiments, yet, this Pharisee, on his release, when he came to Rome to live in a privileged position, with Titus and Agrippa II, must have intensified that hatred which his fellow-countrymen already felt. For a time he may have disregarded it, but later there is some evidence for a change of views, or rather for an out-spoken expression of his ~~own~~ <sup>true</sup> views. Josephus' last work is the most famous ancient apology for Judaism, and he was contemplating a work in four books on God and his essence<sup>8</sup>: his first Aramaic "Jewish War" had been probably a semi-official Roman

<sup>7</sup> V. l. a. 424. <sup>8</sup> Ant. x. 268.



manifesto, directly inspired by Titus and Vespasian, and intended to prevent opposition to Rome in the East. A change did come over Josephus, and, in this connection the death of Agrippa II was a momentous day in Josephus' life, because he now had no one out of respect to whom he felt bound to repress his sincere conviction. From this time probably date some of the seemingly inconsistent anti-Herodian passages in the "Antiquities".

There is thus evidence for a change of view, because Josephus attempted to atone for the past in his writings. The persons with whom Josephus' ultimate views most nearly coincided were probably the Pharisees at Jamnia. Certainly the Zealots still hated him: the Sadducees would have little to do with a Pharisee, and a certain section of the Pharisees probably rejected pro-Roman views. But the Pharisaism of Jamnia, where, about the time of the edition of the Antiquities, the Canon of the Old Testament was beginning to be fixed, was of a revised type, and would not straightway reject Josephus because he lived under Roman patronage. The school of Jamnia demanded emphasis on the "peculiar" history of the Jewish nation, which was to be found in the "Antiquities" and the "Contra Apionem": and Josephus himself was imbued with pride of race. Thus there are certain important points of similarity.

In the end, Josephus failed in what rather resembles an attempted palinode. The Jews did and still do reject him, but the reason is purely because the Christians took up Josephus' works owing to his short mention of Jesus in the Testimonium. In his lifetime too, he does not seem to have been entirely successful. Even if he was in agreement with the school of Jamnia, he would only be in agreement with a small proportion of the Jews. Moreover, Josephus had to think of his position at Rome, and his reputation with the literary circle of Epaphroditus, on which much depended. In this respect, the publication of Justus' "Jewish War" was critical for Josephus. Josephus' counter-attack in the Vita was successful in its result. Thus Josephus justified himself in the eyes of non-Jews, and

especially Epaphroditus, and doing so, recalled early quarrels with Jews. The new Pharisaism of Jamnia alone may have regarded him with favour because of his changed views, but even with them, apprehensive as they undoubtedly must have been of Christianity, the Testimonium, as Josephus probably wrote it, was long enough to arouse suspicion, and not long enough or bitter enough to win commendation from Jews. Josephus died hated by most of the Jews; ~~but~~ but there are signs of growing appreciation of him. Mr. I. Abrahams says of him<sup>9</sup>:-

"Very unjustly, as it seems to me, Josephus has been censured for lack of patriotism, because he feared that the firebrands were more likely to injure Judaea than Rome. Josephus' faults are beyond defence, but lack of patriotism was not one of them. In real patriotism, loyalty to his people's spirit and pride in its institutions, no one, not even Philo, ranks higher". He was not generally appreciated in his life-time, and only after his death by non-Jews. The statue set up in his honour at Rome,<sup>10</sup> and the indifference of his countrymen then and now, show wherein lie Josephus' success and failure.

From Josephus the man we turn to Josephus the historian, in an attempt to see how far his character influenced him for good or for bad as a historian. "His prejudices and idiosyncracies", to quote Oesterley,<sup>11</sup> "make it sometimes necessary to use his evidence with caution".

As a historian, Josephus aimed at accuracy. His repeated assertions about his desire for truth show this. He mentions it in the introduction to each of his three works (B.J.I. esp. 9: Ant. proem. esp. 17: Contra Ap. I. esp. 3), and in the Vita there is a still longer passage about it in a digression on Justus.<sup>12</sup> He knew the importance of evidence in support of a statement, as his list of decrees<sup>13</sup> shows. Even though lack of adequate authorities between Ant. XI and XV causes in the narrative a disproportion which in a work covering such a long period is much to be deplored, Josephus is never a mere plagiarist, because, while keeping very closely to his source,

<sup>9</sup> Schweich lectures. 1922. p. 36. <sup>10</sup> Eusebius Hist. Eccles. III 9. "History of Israel": Oesterley and Robinson. vol. II. <sup>12</sup> esp. Vita 329. <sup>13</sup> Ant. XIV.



he imparts to it something which stamps it with his own individuality, and even tries to correct obvious errors. He is the main authority for the Roman period of Jewish history up to 70 A.D., and a very creditable one. Without Josephus' works, we should be very doubtful about the details of the siege of Jerusalem, and our knowledge of the rise of the Herods would have to be pieced together from coins and incidental references. Whatever is the origin or purpose of the long description of the murder of Gaius, and the accession of Claudius, it is a recognized 'locus classicus', as also is the description of the tactics of the Roman army;<sup>15</sup> and his statements about Homer<sup>16</sup> inspired Wolf's Prolegomena. To appreciate the value of Josephus' works, we have to imagine ourselves without them.

The numerals in Josephus, which are frequently exaggerated, and generally untrustworthy, are an unsatisfactory side of his work, but it cannot be said that their unreliability detracts from Josephus' merits as a historian. The same applies to Herodotus, whose numerals are sometimes entirely fantastic, and to the books of the Old Testament, in fact to nearly all ancient histories, including that of Thucydides himself. Such unreliability is frequently due to manuscript tradition and not to the author.

Josephus' good faith as a historian cannot seriously be questioned, and in good faith he has made mistakes in detail on which critics are quick to seize. It is regarded as doubtful, for example,<sup>17</sup> whether Josephus' statement in Ant. XIX. 279, is true, for it assumes that Claudius knew of the outbreak when he sent the edict: the despatch of Nehemiah to Jerusalem in 460 B.C. (Ant. XI. 159-163) is questioned: Ant. XI. 303 - the end of Artaxerxes' reign - is inconsistent with Ant. XI. 304, dealing with Philip, King of Macedon, for there is an interval of one hundred years passed over without any comment: Ant. XIII. 301 gives an impossible date - 57 B.C. - for Aristobulus' assumption of sovereign power.

There are also inconsistencies which can best be explained by the gradual change of view which can be seen in his character.

<sup>14</sup> Ant. XIX. <sup>15</sup> B.J. II. 345 ff. <sup>16</sup> Contra R.P. I. 12. <sup>17</sup> E.g. by H. J. P. V. D. Balsdon 'The Emperor Gaius', p. 144, note 1.



Particularly is this the case with his attitude towards the house of Herod, signs of which appear also in B.J.II.224-236, 314-353, 605. In all probability there was a second edition of the "Antiquities" published when the Vita was added, and after the death of Agrippa II. It is the second edition which accounts for a passage like Ant. XVI. 395-404, an appendage to Ant. XVI, not in the Latin version, and containing adverse criticism of Herod, and for the two endings at Ant. XX. 259, 267. <sup>18</sup> Laqueur further emphasised Josephus' change of view between the composition of the "Jewish War" and that of the "Antiquities", by comparing in detail Ant. XIV with B.J.I, which is certainly used as a source for the account in Ant. XIV. The general statement that Ant. XIV gives more prominence to Hyrcanus than B.J.I is proved - Josephus even says Hyrcanus went to Egypt <sup>19</sup> - and Laqueur shows the very great number of divergences, particularly in the first half of Ant. XIV, which imply criticism of Herod, Antipater, and even the Hasmonean Antigonus. (e.g. B.J.I.223 = Ant.XIV.277, which is contradictory : B.J.I.318 = Ant.XIV.435, but with different implications.) One of the most striking changes is that in Ant.XIV. 91 compared with B.J.I.170 : in the former Josephus substitutes five συνέβη for the five συνέβη in the B.J., on the occasion of Gabinius' visit to Jerusalem, but omits in the "Antiquities" ἡ ἀπομνήμων, which appears in B.J.I.92. (ἀπομνήμων ἐν ἱεροσολύμοις συνέβη . )

Thus Josephus allows inconsistencies to stand in his works. He may have intended to publish a second edition of the B.J., incorporating his new views. (Laqueur indeed, emphasizing Ant.XX.267, makes much of this.) Certainly another edition would not have caused Josephus much inconvenience, and there are signs of changed views in B.J.II.602-608, as if he started altering his early statements in the "Jewish War". Most of the statements in Josephus' works with which it is impossible to agree, and which most strongly contrast with those elsewhere, are in the Vita, e.g. 169, 373-380. It is to be noted that the Vita deals chiefly with his career in Galilee, which he was defending after attack: the

<sup>18</sup> J. & J. Hist. H. Jos. chap. 5. <sup>19</sup> Ant. XIV. 138.

vituperation is hardly different from that of a Cicero to a Clodius, a Demosthenes to a Philip, a Caesar to a Cato, and the statements made through excess of over-wrought feeling are equally untrustworthy. The revised account of his position in Galilee given in the Vita, brings up the question whether he was guilty of "suppressio veri". Inasmuch as the B.J. only gives a part of the truth he was guilty to a degree, but it was convenient for Josephus and adequate for the non-Jewish public for whom his "Jewish War" was intended. So too with the Testimonium. It seems certain that Josephus knew more about the Christians than his short notice tells us, and that he, with most Jews, despised them. He maintained what has been termed a "stolid silence about Christianity",<sup>20</sup> and gives only a short account, suppressing some of the truth about them. He exhibited an equally stolid silence about the Synagogue, for the word is only used once by Josephus (in B.J.VII.44 : Vita 280 has *ἑρπουχί* .) But in works intended for Gentile readers, such silence is less surprising.

"Josephus is the Greek Livy" - such is Jerome's high estimate of him, implying that what Livy was to the Romans, Josephus was to the Greeks. Both wrote long histories, Livy from the foundation of Rome, Josephus from the Creation, and both histories have survived, as standard authorities on certain periods. Casaubon's estimate of Josephus is similar - "Auctor est in historia *φιλοτιμίας, φιλόπονος*, et multis eximiis virtutibus historico necessariis excellens, ut per me quidem provocare quemvis e graecis historicis. Illud excusare non possum ....." (his treatment of Holy Writ.).

But Josephus remains a Jew: his theme that God punishes the impious, and rewards the pious, is characteristic of this. In so far then, as Jerome calls him the Greek Livy, the description seems perhaps not to do complete justice to Josephus - for he was not a Greek - or to the Greeks, whose "Livy" thus is a non-Greek. Josephus is a Jew who can "challenge any Greek historian", for painstaking care, good faith, interesting and instructive narrative: he may indeed be called the Jewish Thucydides. Nevertheless the personality of

<sup>20</sup> Dr. Lightfoot: Galatians, page 366? St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, p. 366.



Josephus pervades all his works in a different sense from the personality of Thucydides. The retiring, enigmatic personality of Thucydides typified in his laconic statement - "and it befell me to be an exile from my fatherland", is foreign to Josephus who as a man was ambitious and whose besetting sin was pride.

Herein, the essential connection between the study of the man and the historian reappears. Where Josephus lets the unsatisfactory side of his character, the excessive pride of birth and race, born of ambition, gain predominance, his history suffers. In spite of the loud and frequent proclamations which he makes of the importance of truth (even in the middle of his narrative, e.g. Ant.XX.156-157), there are occasions on which his narrative does not compare favourably with Thucydides or Livy. The hostile picture of Berenice, for example, in Ant.XX.145-146, is not considered very credible: the favourable picture of the Herods in the "Jewish War", and the less favourable one in the "Antiquities": the two accounts of his "command" in Galilee in the "Jewish War" and the "Vita": the unnecessarily bitter attack upon Justus in the "Vita" - all these passages, which have occasioned so much adverse criticism of Josephus, are directly or indirectly connected with Josephus as a man. Nevertheless, even if some of his statements are incredible, it is unfair to reject all his statements without careful consideration, and despise him as an authority. Being proud, he was unwilling to confess failure, and was liable at times to scorn the house of Herod and those connected with it. But even Thucydides the man prevails over the historian in the account of Cleon, and Josephus is not more unfair to the Zealots, for example, than was Thucydides to Cleon.

His faults as a man qualify his history, for where he talks of himself, and of events with which he has a strong connection, he is liable to fall short of the truth at which he aims: where Josephus the man is not put to the fore, his history is at its best and worthy to be compared with Thucydides. To account for, and explain, his



faults is difficult, but a clue may perhaps be found in the fact that Josephus was of Oriental Semitic stock, and Oriental peoples are in Western eyes sometimes capable of excess of feeling: hence his pride, due to excessive feeling about himself, and his bitter attacks on his opponents. Unless we can understand or feel sympathy with Semitic character, the true estimate of Josephus' character, and therefore of Josephus as a historian, may elude us.

The faults which we can pick out in Josephus, are not the faults of an unprincipled scoundrel and a second-rate historian, because to maintain such a view is to be blind to everything else except his faults. Although, because of his obvious faults, Josephus cannot be called a great man, he is at least a great historian.

Appendix 1.

J U D A E A.

Governors of Judaea.  
- - - -

	A.D.
Coponius.	6 - 9
Marcus Ambivius.	9 - 12
Annius Rufus.	12 - 15
Valerius Gratus.	15 - 26
Pontius Pilatus.	26 - 36
Marcellus.	36 - 37
Marullus.	37 - 41
(Herod Agrippa I.	41 - 44 )
Cuspius Fadus.	44 - ?
Tiberius Alexander.	? - 48
Ventidius Cumanus.	48 - 52
Felix. (Brother of Pallas.)	52 - 60
Porcius Festus.	60 - 62
Albinus.	62 - 64
Gessius Florus.	64 - 66

- - - -

The dates given are those of  
Schürer, (~~passim~~)

S Y R I A.

Governors of Syria (from 6 A.D.)  
- - - -

	A.D.	A.D.
P.Sulpicius Quirinius.	6 - ?	( 6-11)
Q.Caeciliua Creticus Silanus.	12 -17	(11-17) "Silvanus."
Cn.Calpurnius Piso.	17 -19	(17-21)
Cn.Sentius Saturninus.	19 -21	(Omitted.)
L. Aelius Lamia.	? -32	(21-32)
L.Pomponius Flaccus.	32-?35	(32-35)
L. Vitellius.	35 -39	(35-39)
P. Petronius.	39 -42	(39-42)
C. Vibius Marsus.	42 -44	(42-45)
C. Cassius Longinus.	45 -50	(45-50)
C.Ummidius Quadratus.	50 -60	(50-61)
Cn.Domitius Corbulo. <sup>I</sup>	60 -63	(61-63)
C.Cestius Gallus.	63 -66	(63-66)
C.Licinius Mucianus.	67 -69	
<sup>I</sup> (not mentioned in Josephus.)		

- - - -

The dates given are those of Oesterley  
and Robinson, "History of Israel".  
Vol.II.passim: those in brackets are  
the ones accepted by Foakes-Jackson,  
"Josephus and the Jews."

PROCONSUL was the title for a Roman governor of a province in Republican times. In 27 B.C. Augustus divided the provinces into Senatorial and Imperial (Syria became Imperial): the Imperial provinces were after that administered by a legatus Augusti pro-praetore: the Senatorial by a proconsul. It is therefore inaccurate to speak of the "proconsul" of Syria after 27 B.C.; "legatus" is the correct term.

PROCURATOR. Gow (Companion to School Classics, page 226.) says the full title is "procurator pro legato" who had "almost as wide powers as a legate". Procuratores pro legato were usually of equestrian rank. They are to be distinguished from ordinary "procuratores", who were often liberti, and were purely financial officers of the Emperor.

Herod the Great died in 4 B.C. In his last will, Herod had nominated Archelaus as his successor. The will was disputed by other children of Herod. Augustus, who had to ratify the will before its bequests could be held valid, divided the kingdom into "tetrarchies". -

Philip received Gaulanitis, Trachonitis, Batanea, Auran<sup>i</sup>tis and Paneas. Luke 3. 1. says he had Iturea also. Josephus' accounts are contradictory - Ant. XVII. 189, 319: XVIII. 106: B.J.II. 94, 95 - where Παναρία should be read, according to Schürer.

Herod Antipas (frequently called Herod simply, in Josephus, N. T., and coins.) received Galilee and Peraea.

Archelaus received in accordance with the last will of Herod the Great, the kingdom of his father - Judaea, Samaria, Idumea.

All three had the title of "Tetrarch" - Ant. XVII. 188-190. - Josephus Ant. XVIII. 93, and Matt. 2. 22. call Archelaus βασιλεύς, incorrectly. Herod intended this in his will,



but Augustus did not allow it. Augustus, however, promised Archelaus that he should have the title and position <sup>of</sup> 'King', if he deserved it. (Ant. XVII. 317., B.J. II. 93.)

In A.D. 6, a deputation accusing Archelaus waits on Augustus. As a result, Archelaus was banished to Vienne in Gaul. (6.A.D.) Augustus decided not to put another son of Herod in his place, but to govern it by procurators.

Coponius is the first procurator - cf. B.J.II.117, and Ant. XVIII. 2. - of Equestrian rank. (It was ~~not~~ the general rule to have one of Equestrian rank: Egypt had a governor of Equestrian census.) Tac. Hist. 1. 11. mentions other districts with procurators - "duae Mauritaniae Raetia, Noricum, Thracia et quae aliae procuratoribus cohibentur". For "procurator" Josephus uses ἐπίτροπος, ὑπερῶν, and ἐπαρχος.

#### The position of the procurator, and his relationship to Syria.

Josephus makes the following statements :-

- (1). Ant. XVII. 355. τοῦ δὲ Ἀρχελαίου χάρις ὑποτακτοῦς ἀπονεμηθείσης τῇ Συρίῳ.
- (2). Ant. XVIII. 2. εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἀρροθήκην τῆς Συρίας γενομένην.
- (3). Ant. XVIII. 2. Κωωνίος... πᾶσι τοῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὑπερῶν τῇ ἐν ἡμῶν Ἰερουσάλῃ.
- (4). Tac. Annals. VII. 23. - Ituraei et Judaei ---  
provinciae Suriae additi.

Mommsen. Roman Provinces. Vol. II. page 185, note 1. (English Translation) says 1 and 2 appear "to be incorrect; on the contrary, Judaea probably formed thenceforth a procuratorial province of itself". Schürer has the same view essentially, and says, in effect, Judaea was not "incorporated into the province of Syria".

The test cases are the interventions of the Syrian legate:-

- (a). Quirinius, governor of Syria, is sent out with Coponius, and conducts a census of Judaea and Syria. (The <sup>2</sup> problem caused by Luke's account of a census under Quirinius in the days of Herod the Great is <sup>Sometimes</sup> ~~usually~~ explained now

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix G, with Note at the end.

by assuming that Quirinius was twice governor of Syria.  
(e.g. Oesterley and Robinson. op. cit.) Quirinius had  
special powers delegated by Augustus acc. to Josephus,  
Ant. VIII. 2.

(b). Ant. XVIII. 261 - 309. Petronius, governor of Syria,  
enters Judaea.

(c). Cassius Longinus. Ant. XX. 1. likewise.

(d). Cestius Gallus. B.J. II. 280, 333, 499 - 509 also.  
(Bethhoron battle.)

(e). Vitellius. Ant. XVIII. 89.

(f). Ummidius Quadratus (Syria) sends Cumanus to Rome.  
Ant. XX. 130 ff.

In the case of (a), (e), and (f), special powers had been  
delegated - Tac. Ann. 6. 32. cunctis quae apud orientem  
parabantur L. Vitellium praefecit : Tac. Ann. 12. 54.  
Claudius - jus statuendi etiam de procuratoribus (Quadrato.)  
dederat. So (a), (e), and (f) are exceptional, and cannot  
therefore be taken into consideration.

(b), (c), (d), however, do prove that the governor of  
Syria could legitimately intervene. They do not justify  
the statement that Judaea was under Syria completely. e.g.  
Oesterley & Robinson. op. cit. page 386. - "Although Judaea  
was part of the Roman province of Syria". : Foakes-Jackson.  
op. cit. page 161 "apparently under exceptional circumstances  
his authority in the sphere entrusted to him was absolute", -  
rather it was only under exceptional circumstances that the  
power was not absolute. Indications of this are given by  
the following :-

The procurator of Judaea had supreme military command.

B.J. V. 5. 8. They had judicial authority - e.g. Pontius  
Pilate - over non-Roman citizens. B.J. II. 117. The

procurator had μέγχι πρὸς κέντρον ἐξουσίας ,

and also Ant. XVIII. 2. ἡ ἐν ᾧ ἐξουσία i.e. ius gladii.

The procurator was in control of finance, e.g. Judaea paid  
its taxes "to Caesar". (Matt. XXII. 17 ff., and the other  
Gospels.)



In exceptional circumstances though the governor of Syria could intervene: then, of course, he for the time superseded the Judaeen procurator. But the Judaeen procurator was in no sense an official entirely subservient to Syria, with no absolute power of his own. Mommsen.op.cit. compares the position of the procurators of Raetia and Pannonia with relation to the legates of Upper Germany and Noricum respectively. Schürer Div. I. Vol. II. page 46, says "The procurators of Judaea seem to have been subordinate to the governor of Syria only to this extent, that it was the right and duty of the governor to interfere in the exercise of his supreme power in cases of necessity".

A.D.  
C.6-9.

Coponius with Quirinius (Foakes-Jackson op. cit. passim has the form "Quirinus (Cyrenius)" - Josephus has *Κυρίνιος* e.g. Ant. XVIII. I.) conducts the census. Josephus relates the incident (Ant. XVIII. 29 ff.) of the Samaritans putting dead bodies in the Temple, thereby polluting it. This illustrates the state of tension in Jerusalem at the time, heightened also by objections to the census, which caused disturbances. Ant. XX. 102 ff. Quirinius also deposes Joazar and appoints Ananus high-priest. (Ant. XVIII. 26.)

A.D.  
C.9-12.

After Coponius comes Marcus Ambivius. Ant. XVIII. 31. There is considerable doubt about the form Ambivius. Naber has *Μάρκος Ἀμβίβιος* (following "Casaubonus ad Baron. p.205.1" - Niese.) Niese has *Μάρκος Ἀμβιβούχος* (*ἀμβιβούχος* *Μωζω,* *ἔ* *has* *ἀμβιβούχος*) D (and Lat.) has simply 'Marcus.' Niese conjectures *Ἀμβιβούλος*, which Oesterley and Robinson follow - "Marcus Ambibulus". - page 387, vol. II. 'History of Israel. Ambibulus, however, seems an impossible name for a Roman. Even if he were a Greek by birth, Ambibulus would hardly be a characteristic name. The form Ambivius is found elsewhere; it is known that a certain Ambivius Turpio was Terence's chief actor.



*in his time*

All Josephus says of Ambivius is that <sup>A</sup>Salome, sister of Herod the Great, died, and bequeathed her possessions to Julia. (Ant. XVIII. 31.)

A.D.  
C.12-15.

After Ambivius came Annius Rufus. Josephus says briefly that Augustus died during his tenure of office. (Ant. XVIII. 32.) Tiberius succeeded Augustus. The policy of Tiberius, in keeping governors in provinces as long as possible, is shown in the next two procurators.

Valerius Gratus is sent to succeed Annus Rufus.

(Ant. XVIII. 33.) Josephus remarks that he deposed Ananus from the High Priesthood and gave it to Eleazar: after a year Eleazar was removed in favour of Simon, who in turn gave place to Caiaphas. (Ant. XVIII. 34.) Such changing in the office of High Priest was surely not necessary, and contradictory to the Emperor's own policy of keeping men in office as long as possible. (Tac. Ann. I. 80. IV. 6. : Suet. 23.)

26-36.

Gratus was in office eleven years, when he was succeeded by Pontius Pilate. (Ant. XVIII. 35.)

Pilate was rather inconsiderate in bringing the standards into Jerusalem (Ant. XVIII. 55); but the objections of the Jews to his "wasting" money on building an aqueduct to maintain the city's water supply seem equally inconsiderate. (Ant. XVIII. 60.): the crucifixion of Jesus Christ is mentioned in Ant. XVIII. 63. The Samaritans again fight with the Jews, <sup>and</sup> <sup>A</sup> appeal to Vitellius (Syria) against Pilate's measures to suppress the disturbances. (Ant. XVIII. 88.) Vitellius <sup>came</sup> ~~comes~~ into Judaea, took possession of the High Priestly vestments, deposed Caiaphas, and appointed Jonathan, son of Ananus, high priest in his stead. (Ant. XVIII. 95.)

Later, when making war on Aretas, Vitellius again entered Jerusalem, and deprived Jonathan of the high-priesthood, appointing his brother Theophilus. He is also careful to secure the fidelity of the Jews on the news of Tiberius' death. (37.) (Ant. XVIII. 124 ff.)

36-37.

Pilate had meanwhile been removed from office in favour of Marcellus. The Samaritans had appealed to Vitellius, "legatus" of Syria, against Pilate's actions in Judaea. Vitellius therefore sent Marcellus, "one of his own friends", to take charge (Ant. XVIII. 88, 89.), thus exercising his superior right, as "legatus" of Syria, over the "procurator" of Judaea, and sent Pilate to Rome, to give an account of himself before Tiberius, who, however, died before Pilate arrived there. Josephus gives a full account of the rise of Agrippa I. (Ant. XVIII. 143 - 239.), and his position at the court of Gaius.

37-41.

Immediately on the accession of Gaius, it seems Marullus (Ant. XVIII. 237.) was made procurator. Ant. XVIII. 257 ff. describes the embassy of the Jews to Gaius against the setting up of the Emperor's statue. Petronius, sent by Gaius to make war on the Jews if they refused, dallies (Ant. XVIII. 261 - 309) and is saved by the death of Gaius in 41 A.D.

Josephus' particularly full account of the murder of Gaius may come from Cluvius Rufus (sic Mommsen): Agrippa played a big part, and was made ruler of all the territories Herod the Great has possessed. (Ant. XIX. 236.). The Pro-Jewish policy of Claudius is shown by an edict in favour of the Jews in Ant. XIX. 280 ff.

41-44.

Agrippa I. died in 44. (Ant. XIX. 344 ff.) (cf. Acts XII. 21 - 23.)

Claudius wanted to let Agrippa's son, then aged 17, ~~to~~ succeed his father; but this was hardly possible. (Ant. XIX. 360 - 363.) Procurators were for the time appointed. But the idea was by no means dropped. Agrippa the Younger receives land (Ant. XX. 138.159.) and the right to appoint and depose the High Priest, and to oversee the Temple Treasury. (Ant. XX. 222.) These are surely indicative of what was later to be in store, and also of a desire on the



part of Claudius to reform the abuses due to the arbitrary appointment of High Priests by former procurators.

(e.g. Annius Rufus, above.)

44- ?

Cuspius Fadus is sent as procurator "of Judaea and of the entire Kingdom". (Ant. XIX. 363.) Immediately on his arrival he found a disturbance between the City of Philadelphia and Peraea - it was again the question of Gentile <sup>versus</sup> Jew. He settled this and then had to suppress an impostor named Theudas. (Ant. XX. 97.) A deputation of the Jews to Claudius gained the sanction of the Emperor for the Jews to keep the High Priestly Vestments in their own possession: this privilege, granted by Vitellius, Fadus wanted to take away. (Ant. XX. 3 ff.)

Josephus does not say how long Fadus was in office, nor when or how he was removed, merely "Then came Tiberius Alexander ( ? - 48) as successor to Fadus. He was the son of Alexander the alabarch of Alexandria": he had, however, renounced his religion. (Ant. XX. 100.) His term of office is noteworthy for the great famine which occurred. (Ant. XX. 101.) Josephus says also that he put to death the two sons of Judas, James and Simon. (Ant. XX. 102.) - a famine particularly would cause disturbances.)

48-52.

After Alexander came Cumanus. (In Tac. Ann. XII. 54. he is called Ventidius Cumanus.) He is presumed to have come in 48 because Josephus at the same time mentions the death of Herod, brother of Agrippa, "in the eighth year of the reign of Claudius Caesar". (Ant. XX. 104.) A rebellion was caused by the conduct of a Roman soldier at the Passover, (Ant. XX. 106.) and by the "outrage" upon a scroll containing the Scriptures. (Ant. XX. 115.) Then came another quarrel in which the Jews and Samaritans were involved. Cumanus was bribed by the Samaritans to take no action. Finally, an appeal was made to Ummidius Quadratus, governor of Syria.



He sent the ringleaders of both sides to Claudius, who, advised by Agrippa II, decided in favour of the Jews, recalled and banished Cumanus. (Ant. XX. 118 - 136.)

52-60.

So Claudius sent Felix, the brother of Pallas, as procurator of Judaea. (Ant. XX. 137.) Felix was a "libertus", (Tac. Hist. 5.9.) brother of the libertus Pallas, the favourite of Claudius. Claudius, in the latter part of his reign, seems to have been dominated by these freedmen-favourites: this explains his dispatch of Felix to Judaea, although the governor was usually of "Equestrian" census. From this it can be assumed that Felix was given the Knight's ring before going out to Judaea. Tac. Ann. XII. 54. has a most curious account according to which Felix is governor of Samaria at the same time as Cumanus. Felix also is made to act as a judge in the subsequent trials. Tacitus is not usually followed here.

Tacitus summed up Felix's work as procurator with a characteristic epigram (Tac. Hist. 5.9.) "per omnem saevitiam ac libidinem jus regum servili ingenio exercuit". Felix married Drusilla, daughter of Agrippa I. (cf. Acts and Ant. XX. 143.); he thought he could commit every crime with impunity, supported by one (i.e. Pallas) so powerful. (Tac. Ann. XII. 54.) Contrast the picture in Acts XXIV. 10. for example. Felix had trouble with the Zealots. (Ant. XX. 160.): he is said (Ant. XX. 162 ff.) to have procured the murder of the High Priest Jonathan; but B.J. II. 256. says he had nothing to do with it. There was also trouble in Caesarea. (Ant. XX. 173 ff.) When Agrippa II. exercised his right of appointing as High Priest Ismael, who was the son of Fabi, Josephus says "there arose a sedition between the high priests and the priests and principal man of the multitude". (Ant. XX. 180.)

60-62.

We next read that Porcius Festus was sent out as procurator by Nero. (Ant. XX. 182.) At the same time too,

Josephus says that the inhabitants of Caesarea lodged a complaint about Felix; so perhaps it is justifiable to assume that his part in the suppression of that sedition cost him his office. Again under Festus, Josephus mentions the Sicarii. (Ant. XX. 186.) Extensions to the palace, by Agrippa, overlooking the Temple cause further disturbances and embassies to Nero, successful through the mediation of Poppaea. (Ant. XX. 189: Acts XXV. and XXVI.- Festus and St. Paul.) "And now Caesar, upon hearing of the death of Festus, sent Albinus in to Judaea as procurator". (Ant. XX. 197.)

62-64. Under Albinus further disturbances break out, due to Ananus, a High Priest, later succeeded by Ananias. B.J. II. 273. says that Albinus' sole object was to get money.- Schürer and Oesterley and Robinson accept this. Ant. XX. 204. says "he (Albinus) used all his endeavours and care that the country might be in peace, and this by destroying many of the sicarii". This statement is evidently too complimentary on Albinus, when compared with Ant. XX. 215. Albinus, on hearing that Gessius Florus was coming to succeed him, killed many prisoners "who seemed to him to be most plainly worthy of death", and the others he dismissed when he had taken money from them. "Thus the prisons were left empty of prisoners, but the country full of robbers". (Ant. XX. 215.)

64-66. Gessius Florus. Josephus says ~~that~~ "now Gessius Florus, who was sent as successor to Albinus by Nero, filled Judaea with abundance of miseries". (Ant. XX. 252.) He obtained the position through Poppaea.

Josephus' account of Florus is very black: compared with him Albinus was *δίκαιότατος*, and a benefactor of the Jews: Albinus concealed his wickedness, Florus blatantly paraded it before all: he had no pity, and became even a partner of the robbers: Florus caused the Jews to take up arms against the Romans, "while we thought it better to be destroyed once and for all, than little by little". (Ant. XX. 257.) Schürer



accepts the statements of Josephus about Gessius Florus: Foakes-Jackson (op.cit. page 169) says his misgovernment "may well have been the misgovernment of despair, and have hastened, rather than rendered inevitable, the great Jewish War." Oesterley and Robinson (op.cit. page 438, vol. II) quote Willrich (Das Haus des Herodes. page 160 f.) as showing that "the indictments" (of Josephus) have not really much force in them"; and page 439, "he does not appear to have been specifically inimical to the Jews."

It is generally admitted that Rome's government of Judaea by procurators was not a success. But it must also be admitted that the Jews by their constant petty strife of Jews against Jews (omitting Jew against Gentile for the moment) made any government other than a government by force impossible. The Roman expedient of substituting a procurator for a Herod (who was in turn a substitute for a Hasmonean) failed.

The failure is all the more noticeable and apparently inconsistent when we consider that provincial government under the Empire became more efficient because of the system <sup>of indirect,</sup> ~~ultimate~~ in the case of Senatorial, and direct responsibility in the case of Imperial provinces <sup>to</sup> ~~(with)~~ the Emperor himself. It is surprising too that Rome should have been ~~so~~ negligent of these abuses of government. Neighbouring Egypt was carefully guarded; (Tiberius was angry with Germanicus for entering it without permission), so was Syria. Why should Judaea, which, as Rome knew only too well, had been constantly a source of trouble to Seleucid and Ptolemy be thus left with a rough expedient, particularly since it had inhabitants with such (to the Romans) curious customs and temperaments? The answer seems to lie in the fact that Rome did not go into the question as she should have done: therein lies Roman responsibility. Most historians admit that Augustus' provincial policy, especially in the East, was open to criticism.



Here is an example of Augustus' policy being left unaltered down to 69; except for the short reign of Agrippa I. Tiberius allowed governors to stay for a long time, and pursued the policy of maintaining the status quo - "coercendi inter terminos imperii." (Mon.Anc.) Gaius' short reign was very unfortunate, particularly with Jews. Claudius must be credited with an attempt to change things, but the death of Agrippa I in 44 put an end to this. All he could reasonably do was to revert to procurators until Agrippa the Younger was of age. Unfortunately he misplaced his trust in Pallas and Felix, and other liberti. With regard to the procurators under Nero, Felix, Albinus and Florus were recalled. (Festus died while still procurator.) It looks as though Nero still kept a firm hold over his governors, or tried to do so. But Judaea as it was in those years needed more than a Felix to hold it in check.

Josephus says Florus forced the Jews to begin the war against Rome: (Ant. XX. 257.) that at least is a saner judgement than those given in Vita, where John of Gischala and Josephus charge each other with starting it. To decide war-guilt is a difficult problem. (Thuc. I. re. the Peloponnesian War - this has never really been settled.) But in any case such causes are only partial and immediate. (cf. Epidamnus and Corinth and Corcyra.) War was well-nigh inevitable. If we admit that, from the Jewish point of view, Florus' demand for seventeen ~~talents~~ talents from the Temple Treasury started the war, then that is the spark which set the fire of war blazing. Schurer (Vol. II. Div. I. page 191) says, in conclusion, of Florus - "the combustible materials which had been gathering for years had now grown into a vast heap. It needed only a spark, and an explosion would follow of fearful and most destructive force." This no one would deny: admitting that Florus provided the spark, we have yet to decide who

piled up the material and what the material was, and, lastly, but by no means least, upon whom the blame rather lies, he who provided the spark, or those who provided the material.

To some of these questions this concluding page tries to suggest a reasonable answer.

Appendix 2.K I N G S   O F   P E R S I A .

	B.C.
Cyrus. (King of Anshan)	550/49. :King of Persia.538 - 529.
Cambyses.	529 - 522.
Darius I. (Hystaspes.)	522 - 486.
Xerxes.	485 - 465.
Artaxerxes I. (Longimanus.)	464 - 424.
Xerxes II. (a few months.)	424/3.
Darius II. (Nothus.)	423 - 404.
Artaxerxes II. (Mnemon.)	404 - 359.
Artaxerxes III. (Ochus.)	359 - 338.
Darius III. (Codomannus.)	338 - 331.
Battle of Issus.	333.
Death of Alexander.	323.



SELEUCIDS.THE HASMONEANS.

Seleucus. I. (Nicator.)	311-281/0.		
Antiochus. I. (Soter.)	280-262/1.		
Antiochus. II. (Theos.)	261/0-247/6.		
Seleucus II. (Kallinikos.)	246/5-226/5.		
Seleucus III. (Karannus)	225/4-223.		
Antiochus. III. (the Great)	223-187.		
Seleucus. IV. (Philopator)	187-175.	Mattathias.	
Antiochus. IV. (Epiphanes)	175-163.	Judas Maccabaeus.	166/5-160.
Antiochus. V. (Eupator)	163-162.	Jonathan.	160/59-142/1.
Demetrius. I. (Soter.)	162-150.	Simon.	142/1 -135/4.
Alexander Balas.	150-145.	John Hyrcanus.	134/3 -104/3.
Demetrius. II. (Nicator)		Aristobulus. I.	103/2.
first time.	145-139/8.	Alexander Jannaeus.	102/1- 76/5.
Antiochus. VI. (Epiphanes)	145-142/1.	(Alexandra.	75/4 -67/6.
Trypho - or Tryphon -	142/1-138.	Hyrcanus. (High Priest.)	75/4 -66/5.
Antiochus. VII. (Euergetes.		Aristobulus II.	66/5 - 63.
Sidetes.)	139/8-129.	Hyrcanus II. (High Priest).	63 - 40.
Demetrius. II. (Nicator.)	129 - 126/5.	Antigonus.	40 - 37.
Seleucus. V. (a very short time)	126/5.		
Antiochus. VIII. (Grypos.)	125 - 96.		
Antiochus. IX. (Kyzikenos)	115 - 95.	( Herod.	37 - 4.)
Seleucus. VI. (Epiphanes		Tetrarchies.	
Nicator.)	96 - 95.		
Antiochus. X. (Eusebes.			
Philopator)	95 - 83.		
Antiochus. XI. (Philadelphus)	92.		
Philippus. I. (Philadelphus)	92- 83.		
Demetrius. III. (Eukairos.	95- 88.		
Philopator. Soter.)			
Antiochus. XII. (Dionysus.)	87- 84.		
(Tigranes of Armenia.)	83- 69.		
Antiochus. XIII. (Asiaticus)	69- 64.		
Philippus. II.	65- 64. (Pompey.)		

PTOLEMIES. (Lagids.)ANTIGONIDS.

Ptolemy I. (Soter I.)	305-283/2.	Antigonus I.	- 301.
Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus.)	285-246.	Demetrius. (Poliorceter.)	307 - 283.
Ptolemy III. (Energetes I.)	246-221.	Antigonus II. (Gonatas.)	283 - 239.
Ptolemy IV. (Philopator.)	221-203.	Demetrius II.	239 - 229.
Ptolemy V. (Epiphanes.)	203-181/0.	Antigonus III. (Doson.)	229 - 221.
Ptolemy VI. (Philometor.)	181/0-145.	Philip V.	221 - 179.
Ptolemy VII. (Energetes II. Physcon.)	145-116.	Perseus.	179 - 168.
Ptolemy VIII. (Soter II. Lathyrus.)		168. Battle of Pydna.	
First time.	116-108/7.		
Ptolemy IX. (Alexander I.)		- - - - -	
<del>Second time.</del>	108/7-88.		
Ptolemy VIII. (Soter II. Lathyrus.)			
Second time.	88 - 80.		
Ptolemy X. (Alexander II.)	80.		
Ptolemy XI. (Auletes.)	80 - 51.		
Ptolemy XII. and Cleopatra VII.	51 - 48.		
Ptolemy XIII. and Cleopatra VII.	47 - 44.		
Ptolemy XIV. and Cleopatra VII.	44 - 31.		

31. Battle of Actium.

- - - - -

MITHRIDATIDS. (Kings of Pontus.)

THE ATTALIDS. (of Pergamum.)

B.C.

Mithridates I. (of Cius.)	337/6-302/1.		
Mithridates II. (Vulgo Ktistes)	302/1-266/5.		
Ariobarzanes.	266/5-C. 250.		
Mithridates III.	C. 250-C. 185.	Attalus I. (Soter.)	241 - 197.
Pharnaces I.	C. 185-C. 170.	Eumenes II. (Soter.)	197-160/59.
Mithridates IV. (Philopator Philadelphus.)	C. 170-C. 150.	Attalus II.	160/59 - 139/8.
Mithridates V. (Euergetes.)	C. 150-121/0.	Attalus III.	139/8 - 133.
Mithridates VI. (Eupator Dionysus.)	121/0- 63.	(Having no heir, Attalus III. bequeathed his Kingdom to Rome in 133 B.C.)	
Pharnaces II.	63 - 47.		
Darius.	39 - 37.		



THE K I N G S of P A R T H I A.

Traditional List.

B. C.

Arsaces. (?)	250-248.
Tiridates I.	248/247-211/210.
Arsaces.	210/191.
Phriapitius.	191-176.
Phraates I.	176-171.
Mithridates I.	171-138.
Phraates II.	138-128/127.
Artabanus I.	128/127 -123.
Himerus.	124-123.
Mithridates II.	123-88.
Artabanus II.	88-77.
Sinatrucses.	77-70.
Phraates III.	70-57.
Unknown King.	Before C. 57.
Mithridates III.	57-54.
Orodes I.	57-38/37.

Revised List.

(in Cambridge Ancient History.)

(Arsaces.)	
Tiridates I.	248/247-After 227.
Artabanus I.	Before 208 - ?
Phriapitius.	? 15 Years' reign.
Phraates I.	? - before 160.
Mithridates I.	Before 160 - 138.
Phraates II.	138 - 129 or 128.
Artabanus II.	129 or 128 - 124.
Himerus.	? 128 - ? 124 or 123.
Mithridates II.	124 - 87.
Gotarzes I.	90 - 87.
Unnamed Arsaces.	In 86 and 85.
Orodes I.	In 80.
Sinatrucses.	77 - 70.
Phraates III.	70 - 57.
? Unnamed Arsaces.	In 68.
Orodes II.	57 - 56. (First time.)
Mithridates III.	56 - 55.
Orodes II.	55-38/37. (Second time.)

## The Kings of Persia.

CYRUS. 538 - 529. "In the first year of the reign of Cyrus, which was the seventieth from the day that our people were removed out of their own land into Babylon - " (Ant. XI.1.) Deportations to Babylon are dated 597, and 586,- the latter being the main one. So on this reckoning the first year of Cyrus is  $586 - 70 = 516$ ; which is much too late. The date 597 would make Cyrus' accession 527 - likewise too late. It is known that in 538, Cyrus, King of Persia, issued an edict to the Jews in Babylon to return if they wish;- this is generally taken as the first year of his reign.

CAMBYSES. 529-522. Jos. Ant. XI. 21. says merely "But when Cambyses, son of Cyrus, had taken the Kingdom" - without any date. <sup>III. 14. 16.</sup> cf. Hdt., for Cambyses' expedition into Egypt and his mysterious death there. Jos. Ant. XI. 30. "for Cambyses reigned six years, and ---- died at Damascus." The Revolt of Psendo - Smerdis occurred at this time.

DARIUS.I. HYSTASPES. 522 - 486. "After the slaughter of the magi, who upon the death of Cambyses, attained the government of the Kingdom for a year." (Ant. XI. 31.)

Seeing that Cambyses reigned six years, cf. above, then one year of magi usurpation, another dating may be Cambyses 529 - 523. Magi 523 - 522. Darius 522-486. Rebuilding of the Temple. Ezra VI. 14.15. It was completed "on the third day of the month Adar, which was in the sixth year of the reign of Darius." - i.e. 516. B. C. Contrast Jos. Ant. XI. 106. "Now the Temple was built in seven years' time: and in the ninth year of the reign of Darius, on the 23rd. day of the -- month Adar -- the Israelites offered sacrifice - both for their deliverance and for the rebuilding of the Temple." - This would be in 513, according to Josephus.

**XERXES. 485-465.** "Upon the death of Darius, Xerxes his son took the Kingdom." - Xerxes sends Nehemiah to Jerusalem - Ant. XI. 159-173 - "in the 25th. year of the reign of Xerxes." - 460. The Chronicler says Ezra arrived in Jerusalem in 457; Nehemiah 444.

The present theory of some authorities is that Nehemiah preceded Ezra. (e.g. 'History of Izrael.' Oesterley and Robinson. Vol. II. Chap. X.) Josephus, following the Greek Ezra here as his authority, is generally discredited on the score of historical detail here.

**ARTAXERXES. I. (Longimanus.). 464-424.** "After the death of Xerxes, the Kingdom came to be transferred to his son Cyrus, whom the Greeks called Artaxerxes." (Jos. Ant. XI. 184.)

Esther's supplication for the Jews who were persecuted as a result of Artaxerxes' decree.

(Ant. XI. 303. ends in Artaxerxes reign; XI. 304. starts thus - "About this time it was that Philip, King of Macedon -- was -- slain -- and his son Alexander succeeded him." - Josephus thus jumps about 100 years - "About this time -", omitting to mention Xerxes II, Darius II, Artaxerxes II, Artaxerxes III. The Darius against whom Alexander fought was Darius III. Codomannus. 338 - 331.)

**DARIUS. III. Codomannus. 338 - 331.** Josephus mentions the battles of Granicum, (Ant. XI. 305.) and Issus (Ant. XI. 314.) .

The story of Alexander in Jerusalem is generally regarded as fiction. (Ant. XI. 329-345.) Alexander though did favour the Jews (though this was no extraordinary policy towards the people of the country he was passing through). The Jews were willing to serve in his army: (Ant. XI. 339.) he settled some Jews in Alexandria. (Ant. XIV. 116 - 118.) Josephus Contra. Ap. II. 43. quotes Hecataeus of Abdera as saying -



"Alexander honoured the Jews so much -- that he permitted them to hold Samaria free from tribute."

THE SUCCESSORS. Ant. XII. 1. gives a brief outline of the main results of the ensuing fighting.

PTOLEMY I. SOTER. 305 - 283/2 - seized upon Jerusalem (Ant. XII. 1.) and taking many Jews settled them in Egypt, and distributed some into garrisons. "Ptolemy reigned forty-one years."

IPSUS. 301. (Ant. XII. 11.) Philadelphus then took the Kingdom of Antigonos defeated.) Egypt. Josephus evidently counts from 323. (323-283/2= 40 years.)

PHILADELPHUS. (Ptolemy II.) 285 - 246.

Josephus mainly gives an account of the translation of the LXX, taken from the "Letter of Aristeas" - which took place under Ptolemy II. Philadelphus.

SELEUCUS Nicator. 311 - 281/0.

(Ant. XII. 119.) "The Jews also obtained honours from the Kings of Asia when they became their auxiliaries; for Seleucus Nicator made them citizens of those cities which he built in Asia, and in the Lower Syria, and in the metropolis itself, Antioch; and gave them privileges equal to those of the Macedonians and Greeks."

On the death of Antigonos at Ipsus in 301, Lysimachus and Seleucus divided his Kingdom. Seleucus was a general of Ptolemy's army originally. Seleucus nominally obtained Syria and the modern Mesopotamia. His position not being too secure (Ptolemy, of course, was suspicious) he would naturally conciliate the peoples of his new realm. Hence Ant. XII. 119.

(After XII. 119. Josephus goes into a digression on the Romans, their "equity and generosity", their continued favours to the Jews, and refers to the history of Nicolaus of Damascus. after which he says Ant. XII. 128. "But now I will return to that part of my history whence I made the present digression."

Now it happened in the reign of Antiochus the Great. ---  
223 - 187.

Thus Josephus seems to cover with a digression on Rome another interval of 60 years (Circa) about which nothing is said. Evidently Josephus (or his authority) did not realise the importance of Syria, a continuous bone of contention between Seleucids and Ptolemies. (cf. the three Syrian Wars: In 241, after the 3rd. Syrian (or Laodicean) War, Seleucus II. makes peace. Ptolemy had won the day, for the present.)

ANTIOCHUS the GREAT. 223 - 187.

Josephus says that under him the Jews suffered greatly. Evidently so, considering that Antiochus was at war most of his reign, with Egypt, finally getting back Coele-Syria, at the battle of Panion 201, thus avenging a defeat at Raphia. 217. Rome meanwhile has interfered in Macedonia against Philip (197 Cynoskephalae.) : then turned to Antiochus (defeated at Magnesia. 189. Treaty of Apamea. 188.)

In spite of the sufferings which Judaea must have endured now that she had become a battle ground, Josephus gives letters showing the friendship of Antiochus to the Jews. Ant. XII. 3. 304. (Ant. XII. 129-154.)

SELEUCUS. PHILOPATOR. 187 - 175.

Ant. XII. 229.- "At this time, Seleucus, who was also (Naber has called Soter, reigned over Asia, being the son of Antiochus the Great." His normal title is Philopator. (There was no Seleucus Soter, i.e. Whiston has made a mistake.) The confusion in the High Priestly House is made worse by the contradictory accounts in Ant. and B. J. The High Priest Onias. Hyrcanus quarrels with the other sons of Onias. Ant. XII. 239. says ἐκ δὲ τῆς τοῦ Πρωτοπλάτου μητρὸς ἡ Τωβίου ἀδελφὴ ἐγένοντο. (Menelaus was the brother of Simon, who quarrelled with the High Priest about the taxes. Contrast B.J.I. 31. The upshot is that Hyrcanus withdraws to Ammonite Territory.

During the reign of Seleucus IV. Heliodorus attempted to seize Temple Treasures. cf. 2. Macc. III. 24-8. - the apparition of a gigantic horseman to prevent him. 2. Macc. III. 4 ff. says Simon (son of Joseph) instigated Heliodorus. X. 2. Macc. IV. 1. Simon here is said to have accused Onias on this account.

Ant. XII. 226. Letter of King Areus of the Lacedaemonians; in which racial affinity between Jews and Lacedaemonians is claimed. This is not usually regarded as justifiable.

ANTIOCHUS. IV. EPIPHANES. 175 - 163.

Ant. XII. 234. "But when he (Seleucus IV) was dead, his brother Antiochus, who was called Epiphanes, took the Kingdom."

i.e. Epiphanes usurps the throne from Seleucus' son, Demetrius. (He had once been a hostage in Rome.)

(Ant. XII. 242 ff.)

Tac. Hist. V. 8. 'rex Antiochus demere superstitionem et mores Graecorum dare adniscus, quominus taeterrimam gentem in melius mutaret, Parthorum bello prohibitus est.'

There is slight doubt about the date of Antiochus' reign. Schürer gives 175 - 164. (so Grätz.) I. Macc. VI. 16 says he died 164 - 163. (149. Seleucid Era.) Sulpicius Severus says he reigned eleven years.

His Egyptian Campaign doubtful too. cf. I. Macc. I. 20. X II. Macc. V. 1. either 170 or 168. He desisted at the request of Rome. (Popilius Laenas' famous mot.)

An attempt to stamp out Judaism for Hellenism causes revolt by Mattathias of Modin. (Μωσάϊσμός; μωσαϊσμός FVSuidas; μωσαϊσμός L'Antw; μωσαϊσμός L<sup>2</sup>, μωσαϊσμός E, modin Lat., μωσαϊσμός EKC. Μωσαϊσμός I. Macc. II. 1-5; B. J. I. 1.3. Μωσαϊσμός)

Judas Maccabaeus (meaning doubtful, "hammer" suggested.) carries on, supported by Chasidim. (The party of the 'Pious'.)

Small opposition to Judas by Syria (Ant. XII. 287), which



he easily defeats. Syria now troubled with Parthia, a dangerous rival. When Syria takes pains, the Maccabaeans are always defeated.

### THE MACCABAEAN REVOLT.

Ant. XII. 265 ff. The following points are important:-

A. The revolt was successful in a measure owing to Syrian domestic strike.

B. The revolt attained its end, but went on further.

Ultimately, therefore, this causes rift with the Chasidim.

C. Later Maccabaeans, both King and High Priest.

Judas is made High Priest on the death of Alcimus. - (Ant. XII. 414).

Ant. XII. 414. Schurer believes Josephus is wrong in placing death of Alcimus before Judas. See I. Macc. IX. 54. 59.

Jonathan certainly was elected High Priest. Simon fulfills Jonathan's ambition and secures absolute emancipation from Syria.

### JONATHAN.

Jonathan plays off one pretender against another, to his own advantage.- e.g. With Alexander Balas and Demetrius, (Ant. XIII. 35 ff.) Ptolemy Philometor, eager to secure Koile, Syria once more joins in any intrigues which seek to damage Syrian power. Jonathan killed by treachery (Ant. XIII. 187 ff.) Trypho seizes the Syrian throne. Josephus (Ant. XIII. 212) says Jonathan was High Priest for fourteen years. His usual dates are 160/59 - 142/1. (Ant. XIII. 163, 164. Jonathan's embassy to Lacedaemon and Rome.)

### SIMON.

Ant. XIII. 6. 7. Simon is now made High Priest. His league with Rome. (Ant. XIII. 227.) "So he led the rest of his life in peace, and did also make a league with the Romans."

*The Cambridge Ancient History*

(Ant. XII) sees no reason to suspect this, and comments on Rome's policy of matching rival Kings against each other: she supports e.g. indirectly Alexander Balas. (Jonathan too may have sent an embassy.) Ant. XIV. 145. may be Rome's reply to Simon's embassy. 140. <sup>the</sup> High-Priesthood <sup>was</sup> conferred upon Hasmonian House

"until there should arise a faithful prophet."

Murder of Simon by his brother-in-law Ptolemy. (Ant. XIII. 188).

JOHN HYRCANUS. I. High Priest. (Ant. XIII. 230.). A career of glorious conquest; made possible by decaying Syrian monarchy. League with Romans again (Ant. XIII. 259 ff.). Break with Pharisees: Josephus' reason - Ant. XIII. 293 ff. - that it was due to the importunity of a Sadducee friend is not generally accepted; neither the account of the quarrel with Eleazar. (Ant. XIII. 291). Oesterley and Robinson (op.cit.) think Hyrcanus became King: this would account for the break, but --

ARISTOBULUS. 103/2. Josephus (Ant. XIII. 301.) most emphatically says he first "put a diadem on his head", and proceeds to give an impossible date "four hundred and eighty one years and three months after the people had been delivered from the Babylonish slavery." (i.e. 538 - 481 == 57 B.C.! ) He murders his brother, Antigonus (Ant. XIII. 308 ff.): he died after a year's reign, *χλευματίας μὲν φιλέκην, ἄλλῃ δὲ Σωλευματίας τὴν ἀρίστην* : thus, after its evolution, the Maccabaeen revolt is a paradox: the descendants of its instigators seek to adopt the very movement which its instigators attacked.

ALEXANDER JANNAEUS. 102/1 - 76/5. By this time both Seleucids and Ptolemies have degenerated, so that the rival Kings only rule for a short time before being destroyed by other claimants. Alexander and Ptolemy IX. cf. Ant. XIII. 320 ff. By this time rivalry between Pharisees (originally Chasidim) and Hasmonaeans became intense, - thus Judaea, as well as Syria and Egypt is divided against itself.

Death of Alexander Jannaeus. Ant. XIII. 404. "After he had reigned twenty-seven years, and lived fifty years, save one."

ALEXANDRA. - HYRCANUS II. (High Priest.) His advice to Alexandra, his wife, who succeeded him, (Ant. XIII. 398-404.) to gain the goodwill of the Pharisees, is probably apocryphal. Hyrcanus II.

High Priest along with her. (Ant. XIII. 408.) Aristobulus though, brother of Hyrcanus, supports the Sadducees. War between them on the death of Alexandra. (Ant. XIV. 1. ff.)

Aristobulus the victor is to be High Priest and King. Antipater, an Idumean, now comes upon the throne, (Ant. XIV. 8: XIV. 121 x B. J. 1. 181.) and supports Hyrcanus, for his own ends.

Pompey is now in Syria. Both brothers appeal to him. (Ant. XIV. 34 ff.) And the Jews too, pleading for a High Priest only. Pompey captures Aristobulus. (Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, captured by Gabinius. Ant. XIV. 82 ff. ) 63, Hyrcanus made High Priest. (Ant. XIV. 143.) 57. Gabinius divides Judaea into five districts (*a οὐρεῖσιν*) was held by each of these districts): thus the country was weakened considerably having no central authority. 54. Crassus pillages the Temple Treasures. (Ant. XIV. 105.) In Civil Wars, Antipater is consistently pro-Roman: supported Pompey, then Caesar. (Ant. XIV. 127 ff.) 43. Antipater poisoned. (Ant. XIV. 185 ff. The decrees in honour of the Jews. Julius Caesar (and Augustus) seem particularly favourable towards them.)

Herod, previously in command of Galilee during Antipater's life-time, (Ant. XIV. 158) takes Antipater's place, and follows his policy.

Herod and Phasaël support at first Caesar's murderers, who held Syria. After Philippi they turn to Antony and the Caesarians; Antony makes them tetrarchs. (Ant. XIV. 326.) Cleopatra's designs on Judaea (revival of old Ptolemaic claims on Syria.)

40. Invasion of Judaea by Parthians. (Ant. XIV. 330.): Hyrcanus and Phasaël captives: Herod flees. 37. Herod, still supported by Rome, returns, and is victorious. Antony beheads



Antigonus (40 - 37.) Herod thus removes the Hasmoneans, yet marries Mariam<sup>ne</sup> (Ant. XIV. 467.) daughter of Alexander, the son of Aristobulus II.

Dio Cassius (XL(12)) gives an entirely different account of the fall of Jerusalem from that in Josephus' Ant. XIV.487: the date in Josephus is 37; Dio Cassius has 38 B.C. Josephus' careful dating by consuls, and Olympiad, is 'universally trusted,

Death of Herod. 4 B.C.- this <sup>is the</sup> usual date.

Ant. XVII. 213.- he died "before a Passover."

Ant. XVII. 191.- he died "having reigned, since he had procured Antigonus to be slain, 34 years." e.g. B.C.3.

cf. B.J.I.33.8. But, an eclipse of the moon occurred shortly before Herod's death. (Ant. XVII. 167.) :this was in B.C.4.

cf. Whiston "it happened March 13th., in the year of the Julian period 4710 , and the 4th. year before the Christian era."

The eclipse is conclusive.

Augustus Caesar confirms Herod will (Ant. XVII.317) re. the Tetrarchies.

Then Roman procurators in Judaea. ---- C.66 A.D. The Revolt.

### Appendix III.

#### The supposed dependence of the style of Josephus upon that of Nicolaus of Damascus.

We must be grateful that we possess even some fragments of the works of Nicolaus of Damascus, together with numerous quotations and references to him, though compared with the whole of the 144 books of his History, these fragments are almost infinitesimal. It is thus possible to examine the style of this minute portion of the whole, in the hopes of drawing conclusions about the lost books as well. The following points of style appear noteworthy:-

1. Whereas in strictly classical Greek of the fifth century, almost every sentence is attached to the preceding one by a connection which suits the particular context, Nicolaus either frequently has no such connecting particle at all (a), thus making the style abrupt and apparently disconnected, or has a connecting particle (b), which in the Greek of the fifth century would have been considered inadequate by itself. e.g. (a). 433. *ἡνὶκα ἔγραψε* : 437 (and 442) *ἐκ πύπου* : 437 *ἡνὶκα πύπου* : 441 *ἔρχεται εἰς λόγους* : 445. *πύπου λέγει* : 445 *ἡνὶκα εἶπε* : 446. *ἡνὶκα θυγατὴρ* : 446 *βουλομένης ὥς φησι* : 449 *δύο σκυλαῖες λεβών* : 454 (and 426) *οὗτος ὁρῶν* : 458 *ἡνὶκα εἰπόντα [ἡνὶκα]* : 465. *ἡνὶκα διακρίσας* : 466. *ἡνὶκα εἰρήνη* : 426. *οὗτος ἀκοικῶς* : D. V. A<sup>2</sup> 3. *πύπου ἀδελφός* , γ. *πύπου σὺν* : 8 (and 11) *ἐκ πύπου* : Vita 14. *ἡνὶκα εὐφρόνως ἀποκρίσας* (b). 426. *ἡνὶκα τε βασιλεῖ* : 433 *ἡνὶκα τε* : 438. *δεῖν σὺν* : 446. *ἡνὶκα σὺν* : 450 *τελευτῶν τε*.

2. The use of *σὺ*, *καὶ μή* etc., where *σὺδὲ*, *μήδε* etc. would have been expected according to the strictly classical idiom. e.g.- 430. *καὶ σὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου γίνεσθαι* (though here *σὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ* together, = *ὁ χρόνος* .) 433. *καὶ σὺ* (twice): 438. *καὶ μή* 442. *καὶ μηδὲν* : : these examples are typical of many others also.

3. The use of *ὅς*, preceded by *καὶ* to begin a sentence, as an equivalent to *ὅδε*. The phrase *ἡνὶκα ὅς*, however, is particularly common in the Platonic dialogues, and this may be an extension of it: e.g.:- 426. *ὅς θεσπίζων* 429. *καὶ ὅς*. *ἔτι τὸ σὺν δίσκῳ, ἔτι* ..... 434. *καὶ ὅς* (also in 438. 445. 446. and Vita 418.) 453. *ἐρ' οὗς* :

The numbers refer to the divisions in the edition by Orelli (Leipzig 1804) of the fragments of Nicolaus of Damascus. 2 = De Vita Augusti.

454. ἀνθ' ὧν, 454. ὅς καί, 469. οἷς ἔδωκε, D.V.A. 1. ὧν δέ, 7. ἐφ' οἷς, 14. ὅς τότε.

4. The use of participles not strictly subordinated, and sometimes therefore appearing to "hang" at the end of a sentence, and without strict sequence and use of tenses. (e.g. aorist followed by present or vice-versa: perfect used for idiomatic aorist, e.g. - 425. ἀπαδεύμενος ..... ἔχων ..... διατρέβων ..... αὐτόμενος ..... ἐφ' ὧν ..... ἐγχευόμενος ..... ὑπογράφόμενος ..... ἐμεικλόμενος ..... κλώμενος : 445 αὐτὸς γερμὴν εἰσὶν δόξας ὑπὸ φαρμάκων βεβλήσθαι, ἀπειροβήτου τοῦ ἀράχματος γενομένου, φίλος ἔχειν ἀγρυπνίας ἀγορᾶς ὡς μέγας σπᾶς εἴηεν : 446 καὶ ὅς ἀποθνήσκουσιν εἰς πόλεμον κτείστη ἀρὰς αὐτὸν, ἐπικαλεσάμενος ..... , φίλος ὧν ..... ; 453. δυσανασχετῶν δέ ἐκ τούτου, φεύγων ὥχεται : 454 ἀλλ' ὁδυρόμενος σίκτου πάντα ἐνέκλεισεν, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ εἰσὶν ἔχοντες ἐπὶ τὴν συράν (cf. Thucyd.) . 466. ἦκον ..... ἐκκλιόντες τὴν ἀγορὰν, ἔχοντες ..... φίλοι . 434 εἴτε ἐμὶ σὺν δὲ ὑπὸ ἡλίου πεπετυγμένη (= ἀποθνήσκουσα πεπετυγμένη, = εἰ ἐπεκλύπησεν ) D.V.A. 7. σπουδαζόμενος ..... κεκοινωνηκώς ..... ἡρημένος .

5. The use of ἔτι with an abstract noun, where a concrete mode of expression with an adjective or verb would have been very idiomatic, in classical Greek. e.g. - 426. ἐκινούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ εὐβουλίᾳ καὶ κάλλει νόμου : 441. ἀχθόμενος ἐπὶ τῇ συμφορᾷ : 442 κλέος μέγιστον ἐν λυδοῖς ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνδρείᾳ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ : 445 ἀποχυνόμενος ἐπὶ τῇ ἀρεσσίᾳ : 469. ἀχθόμενος (sc. εἰς πόλεον) ἐπὶ τῇ κτίσει καὶ ἀβύσσῃ τῆς Ῥώμης .

6. The use of the Attic τί for εἶ and other Thucydidean characteristics. e.g. - 446. ἐφύλαττε 449. ἀράττειν 449. ἐσφάττει 450. ἀράττειν 461. ἐλάττουσα 461. παρὰ τῶν 465. φυλάττεισθαι 466. ἀποσφάττουσιν 466. ἀντιδιαλλατόμενοι 466. φύλαττουσι 449. τὸ βύβαιον τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐκ τοῦ ὅρκου ἀποχόμενος (cf. Thuc. IV. 62. τὸ ἀσπόμενον τοῦ μέλλοντος . D.V.A. 3. θάπτον 5. φυλάττουσα 8. ἀροῦσιν . φυλατόμενος 10. φυλάττοιτο . ἦσαν 11. ἀρόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ 14. (and Vita 417) ἦσαν .

7. Quasi-grammatical constructions. -

445. τοῦτον λέγεται : for οὗτος λέγεται (cf. Latin.) : 441. ὡς δὲ ἐγνώσαντο ἀπὸς εἴς αὐτῶν (translated by "quo") 442. ὡς δὲ ἐκείνη συνεκλήθη, ὅπως βούληται (Latin translation "uti".) D.V.A. 12. ὅπως 3 = "de Vita Augusti."



2' ... ... ἄβυσσιν . The construction illustrated by these latter examples is common, however, in Attic Greek, and seems due to a slight confusion with the use of ὡς + Subj. + 2' to express the meaning "until" in primary, and often, for vividness, in historic sequence also.

8. Rare words, and words and phrases which may have parallels in other authors, and unusual forms of words. All of these seem to be very few: e.g. - 430. ἡνιάτο 438. ἡνιάσθαι 437. ἀρραϊγίσιν 458. μὴ ἀντάρχων ἀπογνώσῃς (in Dion. Hal. and Josephus). 458. also ἀντάρχων 462. βουδύματα D.V.A.<sup>3</sup> κοινώνημα (a number of nouns ending in -ημα are to be found in Dion. Hal.) 11. ἀρόνσιον --- ἀοισίτο. (ἀρόνσιον passim in Jos.). 9. ἐνυσηλεύετο very rare: γίνεσθαι etc. for γίνυσθαι e.g. 430. 437. 457. 458. (2) D.V.A. 1. - c.f. Josephus for the form, also, δύω for δύο, 449 and 453.

9. Awkward, cacophonous phrases. e.g. -  
430. ὁ πὺς φίλος ἐκείνου ὁ ἀποκεκομημένος  
437. καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ καὶ ὁρῶ.

10. Judging from the text of Orelli, Elision is sometimes made, and e, sometimes not, there being no uniform practice. e.g. -

437. ἀλλ' ὀδυρόμενος σίκτου πάντα ἐνέπλησεν 430. πάντα εἰπόντος  
433. πάντα ἐγείρει. 445. πάντα εἶπε 458. πάντα εἰπόντα (ἐπὶ πᾶσι)  
461. οὐκ ἐστὶν ὅσον τ' ἦν. 457. πᾶσι δ' ἐκ πύθμενος  
465. ὡς δὲ (καὶ) πάντα εἶμαθαι. 466. πάντα εἶρηται D.V.A.<sup>3</sup> 2. καὶ πὺς δὲ.

11. The remark of Nicolaus about the fable of Romulus and Remus (466) πάντα εἶρηται πᾶσι ἀπὸ Φύβιον, ἔπειτα δὲ οὐδὲν πῶν μυθωδέστερων ἀριστύνειν ἱστορικῇ γραφῇ ἀρροήκειν may be an echo of Thuc. I. 21. and I. 22-4. D.V.A.<sup>3</sup> 2. καὶ πὺς δὲ ἀφελύσσειν τὰ ἀπαρχαμένα, εἰς ὧν ὅσον τε γυνῶναι σύμμεστον τὴν ἀληθείαν. This also shows a desire to seek the "truth", and may be compared with Josephus' remarks on "truth" in Ant. XV. and XVI.

The judgement of Photius (Biblioth. Cod. CLXXXIX) on the style of Nicolaus is τὴν δὲ φράσιν μὲν καὶ οὗτος κεφαλαιώδης, οὐ μὴν οὐδὲν πῶς σαφῶς ἀνακεχωρηκῶς, μετέχων δὲ πῶς καὶ τῶν ἀρροημένων μᾶλλον συστρεφῆς  
<sup>3</sup> = *de Vita Augusti* τε καὶ δεινότητος

<sup>3</sup> = *de Vita Augusti*.

- "the style is concise, without being obscure, with a certain amount of terseness and eloquence".

It is noticeable that the characteristics of style which appear on consideration of the fragments of Nicolaus, are mostly general characteristics of the Greek of the period also, e.g. - 1. 3. 4. 5., for which parallels can be found in the Gospels, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Josephus. They are not then distinctive features peculiar to Nicolaus, and we cannot say that it was from Nicolaus that Josephus copied them. It is difficult even to assess Nicolaus' style throughout his works, from these scattered fragments, which are insufficient to give any real knowledge of his vocabulary.

Conciseness is as far as we can judge, a characteristic of Nicolaus. The style of Josephus on the other hand is far from being such: rather does the difficulty sometimes lie in translating adequately his involved periphrases. Nicolaus also seems to have been seeking after rhetorical effect, a tendency no doubt inherited from his training as a rhetorician. "Rhetorical" cannot however be with justice applied to the style of Josephus: he never had the training in rhetoric sufficient to foster such a style, and the Greek he learned to write was certainly not rhetorical but the narrative manner of historians.

For these reasons it seems impossible to accept a statement that Josephus' style shows borrowings from that of Nicolaus. A priory perhaps, judging by the close use of "scriptural" sources, the theory is plausible, but to say that Josephus borrowed Nicolaus at all<sup>4</sup> verbatim is to neglect the evidence of the small fragments we possess.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. 2. p. 870. - "and much of his (Josephus') style here (Luc. xiv-xvii) probably reproduces that of Nicolaus."



APPENDIX. 4

On the Theory of a "Sophoclean Assistant", who was responsible for Ant. XV-XVI.

(Josephus: the Man and the Historian: pages 115 - 118.)

In addition to the "Thucydidean Assistant", Dr. Thackeray posited a "Sophoclean *αντρυγός*", on similar grounds. This assistant wrote a "delicate style", characteristic of the cultured, refined man he was, and it was certain "felicitous reminiscences" from Sophocles which led to his identification. His influence is to be seen likewise in the B.J., e.g. *Θεάσας δ' αὖτις* (B.J.III.159. Soph. Electra, 995 f.), *ἰφιδεύει ψυχῆς* (B.J.III. 212. Soph. Electra. 980.), as well as in Ant. XVI. 380. *ἄντ' ἄντ' ἡγνώκεί σου δι' ῥέγες* (cf. El. 390. *ἄντ' ἄντ' εἰ φρεσίν;*)

The arguments which hold good against the theory of a "Thucydidean assistant" for Ant. XVII-XIX, are equally cogent against a "Sophoclean assistant": general considerations which have been shown in the foregoing pages hold good against any "assistant" for the Antiquities. Further, the style of Ant. XV. does not undergo any such violent change, as that of Ant. XVII, so that the actual evidence is much more slight. Instead of striking adaptations of constructions, we are dealing with reminiscences only, in Ant. XV. and XVI. So that the same stylistic argument holds good. The general characteristics of Josephus' style are amply confirmed in these books; hence apparent references to the poets alone need explanation. Just as Ant. XX. 263 was sufficient to account for Josephus' acquaintance with Thucydides, so Josephus, through his acquaintance with Greek literature would have studied Sophocles, and may have even unconsciously introduced some phrases from him. Poetical words and phrases, in any case had become common in the prose of the first century, A.D. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, for example, has a number of such words and phrases, including *μῖτος ἐν γαστρὶ κένει*. (Ant. Rom. VI. 93) which is identical with that in Jos. Ant. XVI. 93, and Sophocles, Electra, 1311. Josephus also has "tragic" words elsewhere in the Antiquities, e.g. XIX. 145 *ἡρώδης*. Strong internal evidence is found against the theory of a "Sophoclean



assistant" in Ant. XVI. 174, where  $\alpha\rho\epsilon\theta\epsilon\mu\eta\nu$  means "I, Josephus"; so too XVI. 178.  $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\mu$ , and XVI. 404.  $\delta\epsilon\sigma\iota\mu\omega$  XVI. 187.  $\eta\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  is also the pluralis 'dignitatis', and proceeds with a reference to the royal Hasmonean House from which Josephus was descended. No one but Josephus could have written these passages. (XVI. 398  $\nu\omicron\mu\iota\zeta\omega$  is an emendation by Terry for  $\mu\epsilon\zeta\omega$  .)

The arguments, added to those already elaborated in connection with the "Thucydidean assistant", disprove the hypothesis of a "Sophoclean assistant", which is based on still less probable evidence than the former. Both theories are to be rejected entirely.

## Appendix 5.

<sup>use</sup> Did Luke ~~use~~ Josephus' ~~works~~ 'Antiquities'?

The two passages which have aroused difficulties are as follows:-

"For before these days rose up Theudas, giving himself out to be somebody; to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves; who was slain; and all, as many as obeyed him, were dispersed, and came to nought. After this man rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the enrolment, and drew away some of the people after him: he also perished; and all, as many as obeyed him, were scattered abroad." Acts. 5. 35 & 37. (R.V.).

"Now when Fadus was procurator of Judaea, a certain impostor, whose name was Theudas, urged a great part of the people to take their effects with them, and follow him to the river Jordan; for he told them he was a prophet, and that he would, by his own command, divide the river and afford them an easy passage over it, and many were deluded by his words." (The movement is stopped and Theudas slain.) "This was what befell the Jews in the time of Cuspius Fadus' administration. Tiberius Alexander came as successor to Fadus" ..... "Under these procurators it was that that great famine happened in Judaea." (Queen Helena assisted the Jews during it.) "Moreover the sons of that Judas of Galilee were now slain, who caused the people to revolt from the Romans when Cyrenius came to assess the estates of the Jews, as I have shown in a previous book. (Ant. XVIII.1.ff.) The names of these sons were James and Simon, and Alexander commanded them to be crucified." (Whiston - Shilleto: Ant. XX. 97 - 102.)

Taking these two accounts, it is evident that there is no divergence about the occasion of the disturbance under Judas of Galilee, which was during the census taken by Quirinius. The date of this census has caused much controversy. In 6 A.D., after the banishment of Archelaus the tetrarch, Augustus, having decided to rule Judaea by procurators sent Quirinius as legate to Syria to conduct also a census of Judaea with Coponius the first procurator. <sup>I</sup> This, <sup>the</sup> much

<sup>account of Josephus is generally accepted.</sup> ~~is certain~~ But Luke II. 1 & 2 (cf. Matt. II. 1) has been taken as a

<sup>I</sup> Ant. XVIII. 1. ff.

difficulty - either Luke antedated the census of Quirinius in 6 A.D., or Quirinius was in office twice. (A great deal depends on the interpretation of "first" in Luke 1.2) <sup>Schürer has argued</sup> ~~It is now generally accepted~~ that Quirinius was twice governor of Syria - about B.C. 3 - 2, and 6 A.D. - about 11. A.D., and conducted a census on two occasions: thus both Luke and Josephus are right.<sup>2</sup> As Josephus only mentions the one after Archelaus' banishment (6 A.D.) and Luke only the one during Herod's lifetime, the date for Judas of Galilee must be between 4 B.C. and 2 B.C., or 6 A.D. and 11 A.D. at the outside.

The account in Acts puts the disturbance under Theudas before Judas of Galilee. ("After this man rose up Judas of Galilee.") : Josephus says that the disturbance under Theudas took place when Fadus was procurator. Fadus was the first procurator sent out after the death of Agrippa I. (44 A.D.) Josephus does not say how long Fadus was in office, nor when he was superseded, but merely "Then came Tiberius Alexander as successor to Fadus." Tiberius Alexander is known to have been deposed by 48 A.D. (Ant. XX. 104.) So Fadus was in office we can roughly say from 44 A.D. to C.46 A.D., during which time Josephus puts the rebellion of Theudas. Thus we reach the contradictory dates for Theudas: before 4 B.C.-2 B.C; or 6 A.D. - C.11 A.D., (Acts), and between 44 A.D. - C.46 A.D. There is thus roughly forty years difference in the dates.

On the controversy, associated as it is with the Quirinius' census question, has long been made to depend the credibility and value of Luke, as a historian, compared and contrasted with Josephus. The problem has more particularly taken the form of the question - "Had Luke <sup>read</sup> ~~seen~~ Josephus?"

If Luke had read Josephus' account, then the divergency is either due to carelessness, or to a total rejection of the account and an attempt to correct it, or to the use of a different source. For the view of Luke as a careless writer the evidence is slight: rather is he considered a careful and accurate writer both in the Gospel and Acts. It is unreasonable to say that Luke is careless because his

<sup>2</sup> See note at end



account in two places differs from that of Josephus: Josephus is thus assumed to be a paragon of excellence and accuracy - which is too exalted a view of any historian, and certainly too high for the average historian. On the other hand, this does not mean that Josephus' good faith is to be suspected; still less does it mean that Luke was not writing in good faith.

Yet the view has been held that Luke read Josephus, and even saw him in Rome. Josephus lived in Rome after 70 A.D., at the Imperial court and enjoying Imperial patronage. A fanciful picture is drawn of Luke as an interested member of the audience when Josephus' works were, in the Roman fashion, read in public.<sup>3</sup> This seems to be an example of imagination running riot without the support of adequate evidence. The supporters of the theory would say that having thus heard Josephus' works read, Luke then inserted the account into his narrative, with this difference, that, whereas in Josephus the order is Theudas - Judas, though the chronological sequence is the reverse, Luke however remembered the order Theudas, Judas, and assumed chronological sequence, forgetting that Josephus was really speaking of the sons of Judas, and only as it were in parenthesis of Judas himself.

Besides the fact that the theory is in itself highly fanciful, there is also the assumption that Acts was written after the Antiquities. Broadly speaking, the Antiquities was written between 93 and 100 A.D. (This omits for the moment the question of the first edition of Antiquities in 94 A.D., and the second, with Vita appended in 100 A.D.) The only important view of Acts being written after 100 A.D., is that of the Tübingen school of critics, who claim 150 A.D. as its date. Few authorities now accept this, objecting that were 150 A.D. the date there would be a reference to the Pauline Epistles. It is pointed out further that Acts ends abruptly as if it had reached contemporary events: the representation of the Jews as enemies of the Church, and the Romans as friendly to the Christians, the primitive terminology e.g. ἐκκλησία, not yet

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Strickland, *Four Gospels*, page 554: Strickland himself, however, does not accept the view.

established in any standardised form, the inability of the Romans to distinguish Jews and Christians in Acts (by the time of the Neronian persecution they did so, officially) - all these points taken together militate against the view of a late date for the composition of Acts. Even if two editions of Acts were assumed, as with Streeter and Blass, one early and late (after 100 A.D.) there is still the difficulty that the assumed redactor for the second edition has not worked up Acts, but left it still with its abrupt ending. Some even say (e.g. Burkett & Wendt) that Acts was written between 90 and 100, simply because they believe Luke read Josephus: but to base a theory on an inadequately attested hypothesis, in disregard of other telling considerations, is unreasonable. All the evidence points to an early date for Acts, and for the present purpose it is enough to prove that Acts was written before 94 A.D. (the first edition of the Antiquities.) On this practically all authorities agree: the limits either way are now generally taken as 81 A.D., for the latest possible date, and 62 A.D. for the earliest date. This then destroys the hypothesis that Luke copied Josephus, seeing that the Antiquities was not yet published, nor in all probability the Bellum, when Acts was written.

There remains a possibility that Josephus saw Luke's work: this is even more fantastic than its converse, in the circumstances. Josephus was at the Imperial court, writing semi-official manifestos (e.g. the Aramaic Bellum), and it would not have been in his interests, apart from that, to meddle with the literature of a religion which the Roman government, when he wrote the Antiquities, not only refused to recognise, but persecuted. From the personal point of view also we can reasonably expect a Jewish priest of noble Hasmonean stock, as was Josephus, to despise such a "sect" of Christians,<sup>4</sup> and certainly not to use their writings as a source, even if it is only to contradict and correct.

If the above arguments for the date of Acts are plausible, it

<sup>4</sup> This is proved by a consideration of the 'Testimonium Flavianum'.



can be said definitely that Luke did not read Josephus. Further, it can also be objected that there are differences in detail between the accounts. Luke says "a number of men about 400, followed Theudas." There is no such detail in Josephus who says "Theudas was an impostor, who persuaded a great part of the people....." Luke does not mention the claim to divide the Jordan, nor that the head of Theudas was carried to Jerusalem. Such differences are surely important, and point, at least, to different sources not dependent the one upon the other. It looks as though what seemed once a glaring anachronism in Luke, is in fact no anachronism at all.

We have thus some reasons which allow us to assume that Luke did not read Josephus. Such a conclusion clears the ground, but does not give a solution to the passages. It is natural to turn to the texts, but with regard to Luke, critics can here find no room for doubting the genuineness and correctness of the names in the order Theudas - Judas. So they turn to Josephus, and realising that his text was handed down by the Christians, with interpolations (e.g. in Testimonium and John the Baptist passage), argue that a Christian hand, wishing to confirm Acts, inserted  $\Theta\omega\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   $\delta\iota\omicron\nu\omicron\rho\eta\delta$  into Josephus' text. But it is doubtful whether such an interpolation would confirm Acts: in fact it is just the  $\Theta\omega\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   $\delta\iota\omicron\nu\omicron\rho\eta\delta$  which has given rise to so much dispute, and led in some cases to the total discrediting of Acts and Luke. It needs more than an interpolation of two words to confirm Acts, or indeed any author. Further, why should Acts need any such confirmation? the tacit assumption underlying this is that Acts is wrong and Josephus right. Such a judgement has to be attested, before being assumed. Some hold that §§ 97-98 were interpolated into Josephus: in the earlier part of the book is a long digression on Adiabene (Ant. XX. 17-96), the moral of which is "embrace Judaism and be loyal to Rome," and as the book is thus patched together, so the interpolation of §§ 97 and 98 may easily have been carried out. Even this, however, does not solve the problem, "why does the text



of Josephus, thus interpolated" appear to differ from Acts ? All interpolation theories in this case seem to throw the difficulty one step further back, making it necessary to explain why the interpolator acted thus. Interpolation is more general as an attempt to evade difficulties, (hence the canon - *lectio difficilior praestat.*) than to increase them.

On more general grounds too the theory of Luke having seen Josephus seems untenable. At this particular point both authors are dealing roughly with the same general period. Once this fact is noticed, there is a great tendency to assume that the books were interdependent and connected. Such a connexion would be highly interesting, could it be found. But the general plausibility of a possible connection between the authors must not blind us to the more particular indications that Acts was very probably written before the Antiquities. It is sometimes argued that a Christian writer would have little or no records for the events of his time, and so would have to turn to Josephus. This argument tends to assume that the number of records of events available in Rome at the time, was almost exactly the same as those available now. Anything more misleading than such an assumption is hard to imagine: it is recognised indeed as one of the sad facts that the authors we possess of Greek and Roman literature are by no means all but only a small proportion of all who composed. Indeed, we know the names of many writers, and works, famous and considered authoritative in their time, which have not come down to us except as mere names.

The question of the sources is also against the theory. Aramaic<sup>5</sup> documents or oral tradition are generally recognised as the source for Luke. He is telling the story of events very near and dear to him, in which he himself is known to have taken some part.<sup>6</sup> It is unlikely that Luke should (even if the 'Antiquities' were published) go to Josephus, a hostile author, for details which after all only come in incidentally as examples in Gamaliel's speech. Indeed a study of the details has shown that they are different in Luke and

<sup>5</sup> esp. by Torrey. <sup>6</sup> e.g. the 'we' passages in Acts.

Josephus. Josephus' sources were not the same as Luke's; neither was the history of events particularly near or dear to him. His main interest begins in 63 A.D., the date of his journey to Rome. We know too that Josephus had access to the official Roman records (e.g. the commentarii of the <sup>Emperor Vespasian</sup> ~~important figures~~) - a privilege which Luke would not have.

Which account then is right? The only reasonable conclusion is that both are right, and that Theudas does not refer to the same person in both accounts, but to different men of the same name. When we think that Theudas was, like Jesus, a fairly common Jewish name, and that trouble was constantly being caused by false prophets, who often became merely marauding bandit chiefs with a few Zealot followers, the conclusion is confirmed. Neither Luke nor Josephus are the type of writer to mislead their readers intentionally, and they must have had some reason for dating Theudas where they do. This is the only solution which fits in with the <sup>data</sup> ~~(facts)~~. Josephus was not entirely untrustworthy, neither was Luke, and there was no connection between them because of the date of Acts: they can only be referring to a different Theudas. To say then that Luke saw Josephus' Antiquities because both authors have a passage roughly on the same subject seems as unreasonable as the suggestion that because Josephus was shipwrecked on the way to Rome, and because St. Paul may have been shipwrecked about the same time (assuming one chronology of St. Paul's journeys), ~~(that)~~ they were therefore both in the same ship, and were wrecked together.

BY

Vila 342.

NOTE. Quirinius' tenure of office.

Quirinius seems to have been 'legatus' of a province twice. Mommsen and Ramsay attributed the inscription which mentions a man who was twice governor, to Quirinius. This is only a hypothesis, and it must be emphasized that to say Quirinius was twice governor of Syria, is a still further hypothesis. Mr. R. Syme has argued that Quirinius conducted the ~~Homadensian~~ <sup>Homadensian</sup> war as governor of Galatia and Pamphylia. The ~~ἐπὶ τῇ~~ <sup>ἐπὶ τῇ</sup> of 6 A.D. (cf. Acts V. 37.) was accompanied by the establishment of complete Roman rule, and occasioned the rising of Judas. Josephus (Ant. XVIII. 1.) seems to imply that Quirinius was on a special mission, as ~~ἐκκρίσας~~ <sup>ἐκκρίσας</sup> and ~~πρυτανεύσας~~ <sup>πρυτανεύσας</sup> (cf. B.J. VII. 253). Quirinius had had experience in 4 - 2 B.C. (Luke II. 2.), when Gaius Caesar was in the East, and was therefore fitted for an extraordinary mission in 6 A.D.